

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MILITARY LEADERSHIP STYLES OF
GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
Military History

by

JAMES R. HILL, MAJ, USAR
MA '96, BA '90, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
2008

Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 13-06-2008		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) AUG 2007 – JUN 2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MILITARY LEADERSHIP STYLES OF GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ James R. Hill				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT In a constantly changing world threatened by ever increasing terrorist acts, American interests both at home and abroad more frequently require protection provided by great military leaders. In order to produce military leaders who can successfully meet the challenges America faces, it is important to develop their leadership skills. The process of developing leadership skills, however, is not easy and it requires a prodigious amount of determination, time, planning, training, mentoring, and refinement. One way to help develop leaders is to show them examples of previously successful leaders, leaders such as George C. Marshall and Dwight D. "Ike" Eisenhower. Marshall and Eisenhower were two talented and exceptional leaders and are great examples of American military leadership. Their leadership styles were indispensable during World War II, and it is important for leaders today to examine why their leadership styles were so successful. Leadership, George C. Marshall, Dwight D. Eisenhower					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 141	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: MAJ James R. Hill

Thesis Title: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MILITARY LEADERSHIP
STYLES OF GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND DWIGHT D.
EISENHOWER

Approved by:

_____, Thesis Committee Chair
Jonathan M. House, Ph.D.

_____, Member
Bradford A. Wineman, Ph.D.

_____, Member
Robert J. Reilly, M.S.

Accepted this 13th day of June 2008 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MILITARY LEADERSHIP STYLES OF GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, by MAJ James R. Hill, 141pages.

In a constantly changing world threatened by ever increasing terrorist acts, American interests, both at home and abroad, require protection provided by great military leaders. In order to produce military leaders who can successfully meet the future challenges America faces, it is important to develop and refine them early and help them understand how to create and refine a successful leadership style. The process of developing leadership styles, however, is not easy and it requires a prodigious amount of determination, time, planning, training, mentoring, and refinement. One way to help develop leaders is to show them examples of previously successful leaders, leaders such as George C. Marshall and Dwight D. “Ike” Eisenhower. Marshall and Eisenhower were two talented and exceptional leaders and are great examples of American military leadership. Their leadership styles were indispensable during World War II, and it is important for leaders today to examine why their leadership styles were so successful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completing this Master's thesis has been personally challenging yet rewarding. It provides me with a great deal of satisfaction to see such a labor of work completed. It would not have been possible, however, without the support and guidance that the members of my Masters Thesis Committee provided. Therefore, I would like to thank the Chair of my committee, Dr. Jonathan House as well as Dr. Bradford Wineman and Mr. Robert Reilly, the other two members of my committee. Their reviews of my many drafts were insightful and enabled me to better hone my thoughts. In addition to my committee members, I would also like to thank my Student Group Advisor, Gary Hobin, for his helpful comments. Finally and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife, Natalie, and my two children, Olivia and Gabriel, for their support. They have always been a source of inspiration for me. Throughout this process, they often encouraged me to keep plodding along in my research, and they understood when I had to leave during the weekends to sequester myself away in my CGSC classroom to work on my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 SMALL TOWN UPBRINGING, MILITARY EDUCATION, AND RELIGION.....	6
Marshall's Small town Upbringing and Military Training at VMI	6
Eisenhower's Small Town Upbringing and Military Training at West Point	17
The Importance of Religion in Leadership	25
The Importance of Religion in Marshall's Leadership Style.....	27
The Importance of Religion in Eisenhower's Leadership Style	32
CHAPTER 3 LEADERSHIP PHILOSOPHIES AND OFFICER MENTORSHIP	42
Marshall's Military Leadership Style	43
Eisenhower's Military Leadership Style.....	51
Developing Leadership Abilities through Officer Mentorship.....	60
CHAPTER 4 DUTY, DISCIPLINE, POLITICS, AND SUBORDINATES.....	78
Leadership Style and Duty.....	78
Marshall's Views Regarding Duty	79
Eisenhower's Views Regarding Duty	85
Leadership Style and Discipline	90
Marshall's Views Regarding Discipline	90
Eisenhower's Views Regarding Discipline	94
Politics in the Army and Its Impact on Discipline.....	97
Leadership Style and Subordinates.....	104
Marshall's Views Regarding Subordinates.....	104
Eisenhower's Views Regarding Subordinates	109
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	129
PRIMARY SOURCES	129
SECONDARY SOURCES	130

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	134
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

How do military officers develop their leadership styles? In order to successfully answer this question, it is necessary to examine, as closely as possible, a person's life experiences in order to see how those experiences shape their understanding of what leadership is in the military. If through examination it is possible to see how successful officers developed their leadership styles, then that information might be useful for current and future officers. Invariably, many find solace in simply stating that great leaders are born and thus leadership abilities are God given. This argument is eugenics based and suggests that leaders are born with inherent genetic attributes that provide them natural leadership abilities.¹ Edgar F. Puryear, Jr. asked General J. Lawton Collins, the Commander of the VII Corps in the Army during World War II, what he thought about leadership. He responded, "Only a limited number of people combine the necessary qualities of character, integrity, intelligence, and a willingness to work, which leads to a knowledge of their profession to become successful leaders. These are God-given talents we inherit from our forefathers." He also added, however, that "There are...techniques of leadership that anybody can learn if given a modicum of intelligence and a willingness to work."² Collins' position was mostly eugenics based, and it demonstrates that he did not think society or environment had much of an impact on the development of an officer's leadership abilities. When Puryear asked General Omar Bradley the same question, he noted that Bradley thought some leaders were born with certain qualities of leadership such as a good physique, good mental capacity, and curiosity, but that there were other leadership qualities that needed to be developed such as job competence and

learning from others.³

To some degree, both Collins' and Bradley's comments have merit. Certainly military leaders need to have the intellectual ability to learn and remember information, and they must also have the physical ability and stamina to lead. They could not, for example, be effective leaders if they could not learn and retain information, or if they were physically unable to lead. Collins' and Bradley's comments, however, give short shrift to the impact that society can have on the development of leadership ideals and practices.

Each officer has a unique leadership style that is a reflection of their personal beliefs, leadership ideals, and military practices to which they adhere. Because each person has unique life experiences, it is not easy to scrutinize which beliefs, ideals, or practices produce successful leadership styles. For the purpose of this thesis, however, leadership style will be based on the following characteristics of an officer's life: upbringing (to include relationships with parents and siblings), work ethic, desire to learn, concern for religion and morality, attention to officer mentorship, and beliefs about duty, discipline, politics, and working with subordinates. Together these characteristics will provide a framework for analyzing and understanding leadership styles.

By examining in detail two effective and successful officers during World War II, it is possible to ascertain certain leadership beliefs, ideals, and practices that will enable future military officers to develop a successful leadership style. Two fine examples of American military leadership during this war were George C. Marshall and Dwight D. "Ike" Eisenhower. Their leadership skills were indispensable during the war, and it is important for military officers today to consider how they were able to develop their

leadership styles that made them so crucial.

To show today's military leaders how Marshall and Eisenhower were able to do this, it is necessary to carefully examine their lives from their upbringings through their respective roles during World War II. By examining Marshall's upbringing in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, and Eisenhower's upbringing in Abilene, Kansas, it is possible to see how both men developed strong work ethics and a desire to learn. In addition to their upbringings in small rural communities, it is also important to consider the impact religion, and the Bible in particular, played in their lives and how it helped shape their understanding of morality and character. These aspects of their early years laid the foundation for the development of their leadership beliefs, ideals, and practices and thus their leadership styles.

Further, after each entered his respective service academy, it is possible to see how they utilized what they had learned from their upbringings and applied that to help them develop their abilities and talents in order to become effective leaders. After Marshall graduated from the Virginia Military Institute (VMI) and Eisenhower from the United States Military Academy (West Point), they had similar beliefs, ideals, and practices that became integral aspects of their leadership styles.⁴ For example, both believed leaders should have a tireless work ethic that compels them to work until a job has been completed. They also believed leaders should have a desire to learn and practice to become competent in the job they were required to perform. In addition, Marshall and Eisenhower believed that Soldiers needed to lead religiously focused and moral lives. By doing so, they thought that leaders would positively influence those that they led, and this benefited both the individual Soldier and the army. Furthermore, both

Marshall and Eisenhower understood the impact that politics had on the Army and on Soldiers and while in uniform they stayed clear of political imbroglios. Finally, both realized that leaders needed to fulfill their duties, always maintain discipline with their troops, and successfully interact and develop their subordinate leaders. Cumulatively, these beliefs, ideals, and practices shaped their leadership styles and brought both of them important recognition from influential American military leaders such as Leonard Wood, Hunter Liggett, J. Franklin Bell, Fox Conner, and John J. Pershing for Marshall, and Fox Conner, Pershing, and Marshall himself for Eisenhower. The mentorship they received from these leaders propelled them to greatness and in the process helped them hone their leadership styles. As a result, both believed that mentoring subordinates was an important aspect of leadership and something both inculcated into their leadership styles.

This thesis closely examines the lives of these two superb American military leaders in the hopes of providing two examples of successful leadership styles for current and future military leaders to consider. Much of the research on Marshall is limited to secondary sources and that is due to Marshall's own efforts to keep his records out of historical analysis. The only authorized biographical study done on Marshall was completed by Forrest C. Pogue, a soldier and writer during World War II whom Marshall approved. Pogue completed a four volume analysis on Marshall and all four were considered in this research. The research on Eisenhower was partially completed at the Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, Kansas. As a result, there is a great deal of primary source documentation on Eisenhower included in this thesis. Also, the thorough biographical study done by Stephen Ambrose is frequently cited.

This thesis does not consider a careful examination of Major General Fox Conner,

although it should. The reason for this shortcoming is that Conner had his wife destroy all of his records after this death. He, like Marshall, wanted to keep his records out of historical analysis. This is a real dilemma for military historians of this time period, especially since Conner was a key figure in both Marshall and Eisenhower's lives. Perhaps records of Conner will be uncovered one day, which will hopefully provide greater clarity on this important military leader.

In addition to not examining Conner, this thesis also does not provide an analysis about the leadership styles of other key leaders that Marshall and Eisenhower encountered. For example, Generals George S. Patton, Omar Bradley, Henry Arnold, Matthew Ridgeway, Leonard Wood, Hunter Liggett, and J. Franklin Bell are not considered. In addition, Admirals Ernest King, William Halsey, and Chester Nimitz are not considered. A later examination and comparison of all of these leaders could provide a more thorough analysis about how and why Marshall and Eisenhower chose to lead the way that they did.

NOTES

¹ Eugenics: a science that deals with the improvement (as by control of human mating) of hereditary qualities of a race or breed (Merriam-Webster Dictionary On-Line: <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/eugenics>).

² Edgar F. Puryear, Jr., *Nineteen Stars: A Study in Military Character and Leadership* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1992), xi.

³ Ibid., x.

⁴ The United States Military Academy at West Point, New York will hereafter be referred to as West Point, and the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, Virginia will hereafter be referred to as VMI.

CHAPTER 2

SMALL TOWN UPBRINGING, MILITARY EDUCATION, AND RELIGION

In order to understand how past military leaders developed their leadership styles, it is first necessary to consider how they were raised and how they viewed the world in which they lived. The foundations for establishing truths in life are developed during youth and are only fine tuned during adulthood. Children are by their very nature young and impressionable and have an understanding that the world is in front of them. Thus, it is important to closely examine how each military leader's world was shaped by his parents and siblings. This examination must also consider the following about their lives: the time in history they lived, the community in which they were raised, the schools they attended, and the religion or theology that they studied. Certainly this type of examination is not an exact science, but these variables can provide a great deal of insight into the way a person thinks. That clearly was true for both Marshall and Eisenhower because their upbringings significantly shaped the leaders that they became.

Marshall's Small town Upbringing and Military Training at VMI

The experiences Marshall had during his upbringing laid the foundations for how he perceived the world and thus how he developed his leadership style. He was born in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, on December 31, 1880. Uniontown is located about seventy miles south of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, not too far away from the Maryland and West Virginia state borders. In 1880, it was a small town of about 3,500 inhabitants.¹ Most of the citizens of this town were conservative minded and mired in the not too distant memories of the Civil War. They were mostly rural farmers, who were native-born,

Anglo-Saxon and Scotch-Irish Protestants, and they were not comfortable with newly arrived Irish and German immigrants settling and looking for work. According to Marshall biographer Forrest C. Pogue, “Even while coal miners tore up the farmlands; even while immigrants came in thousands to work the mines...still the old inhabitants were not at once jarred out of their rural isolation, still less out of their rural habits of mind.”² Despite the many changes industrialization was gradually bringing to this town, Marshall still considered it a rural town with stone bridges, apple orchards, rivers, tributaries, and several small hollows. Pogue points out that, for Marshall, Uniontown, “remained small enough...to be encompassed as a kind of family domain by a small boy who ‘knew about everybody in town’ and walked everywhere.”³

Marshall’s family lived in a modest two story, brick house at the western end of the main street running through town.⁴ He was one of three surviving children in a respected, middle-class, family that was distantly related to former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Marshall.⁵ In addition, he was baptized and brought up in the Episcopalian faith. His father, George Sr., for whom he was named, was a successful entrepreneur in the coal coke industry. In 1870, after a few ventures, George Sr. and a few of his business partners developed a thriving business processing coal coke for the steel industry. He and his partners profitably ran this business for 19 years. In 1889, however, the elder Marshall agreed to sell most of their company to Henry Clay Frick for an enormous profit.⁶ He took his profits from the sale and, against his wife’s wishes, invested in land and a resort hotel in Luray, Virginia, a small Blue Ridge Mountain town near the Shenandoah River. Just after he invested his money, the real estate market in the area collapsed and the hotel caught fire. “[George] Sr. lost almost overnight all he had

worked for and gained in the preceding twenty years,” as Marshall biographer Mark A. Stoler notes. “George [Jr.] would later refer to this decision of his father as ‘the great mistake of his life, and much against my mother’s advice.’”⁷ Seeing his father go through this experience taught Marshall to live frugally and within his means.

George Jr. respected his father, and he especially enjoyed the limited time he spent with him. He desperately wanted to bond and emulate him, and he always enjoyed hearing his father’s Civil War and family history stories. His father, however, was not always easy to approach, was a strict disciplinarian, and because of his early career successes was slightly arrogant. “Mr. Marshall had his own sense of rather prickly importance.... [He was] sensitive to criticism and quick to anger, he did not enjoy jokes on himself” Pogue argues. In addition, Pogue notes that “He was inclined to be stiffer within the family because families are notoriously less considerate of the slight ego-stuffing that he seemed to feel was necessary to keep him properly poised.”⁸ His father’s unapproachable, strict, and egotistical behavior left Marshall feeling that his father did not care for him. Pogue mentions that, “George always struggled for his father’s approval but was also a little afraid of him.”⁹ In fact, Pogue mentions that Marshall felt that his father actually favored his older brother Stuart. He also believed his father was ashamed of him. In a revealing interview with Pogue, Marshall recalled his father’s embarrassment and disappointment in him when, as a young student, he could not answer a few educational class placement questions during a meeting with a school principal. According to Pogue, Marshall felt that his father “suffered very severely.”¹⁰ Regardless of what his father actually felt, Marshall’s comment indicates that he felt as though he had greatly disappointed his father, and it was a memory that stayed with him throughout

his life and something he felt obliged to share with Pogue. In fact, his desire to please his father may in some ways have motivated him to succeed later in life. Undoubtedly, the relationship he had with his father had a profound impact on Marshall. Stoler goes so far as to argue this relationship made Marshall feel rejected and contributed to his feelings of low self-esteem in his youth.¹¹ Because of this, Marshall seems to have sought fatherly approval and understanding from a surrogate father.

Pogue provides evidence that Marshall sought out and found a “close and adult friendship with the young pastor the Episcopal Church, which the Marshall family attended.”¹² The pastor was John R. Wightman, and Pogue notes that, “Wightman is a hazy figure in the records, and the General, while recalling him as an important influence, said little about him.” He also adds, however, that Wightman and Marshall used to take long walks and Marshall “came to know him intimately and was very much impressed by him.” Pogue concludes that, for Marshall, Wightman was likely “one of the rare adults to whom he could freely talk and that he was perhaps enabled in this way to reach out intellectually along paths not opened by his father or by his school teachers.”¹³

Marshall’s need for a surrogate father is telling and speaks volumes about his childhood experiences and home life. From a contemporary viewpoint, a relationship such as this would likely be construed as unusual, likely inappropriate, and definitely not of the norm. However, there is no evidence to suggest this relationship was inappropriate or unusual. Nonetheless, the impact of a prominent religious figure during Marshall’s formative years surely must have helped shape his Christian views on right from wrong, morality, the sacraments, and death. As a result, this must be factored into any analysis about how he developed his leadership style. Despite his seemingly unfilled relationship with his

father, he had a great relationship with his mother.

Marshall viewed his mother Laura differently. He was comfortable with her and confided with her about both good and bad things he experienced. According to Pogue, “he told her everything.”¹⁴ In an interview with Pogue, Marshall stated that he confided in his mother, because “She never corrected me.”¹⁵ Indeed, Marshall viewed his mother as quiet, patient, sympathetic, supportive, and humorous. Pogue also notes that “she seems to have rejoiced in him as he was and did not seek out and reprove his faults as his father so often did. He depended on her for that.”¹⁶ Stoler adds that “she was the most important person in his childhood and by his own recollection, a ‘constant and lasting influence on my life.’”¹⁷

Many of Marshall’s personality traits as a student and leader can be directly tied to his relationship with his parents. For example, much like his mother, he was frequently described as a quiet, patient, and standoffish leader. Also, he married women that treated him much the way that his mother treated him. As a result, these women meant everything to him, and he treated them extremely well. Further, much like his father, he always wanted to succeed, feared the embarrassment of failure, and was sensitive to criticism. Clearly his parents had a significant and undeniable impact on how he developed his leadership style. It also impacted how well he performed in school.

Marshall’s experiences in school as a youth had an impact on the leader that he became. He was a tall, awkward, clumsy, quiet, and aloof student. He hated being laughed at and feared speaking in public. Pogue notes that he was, “A poor student for many years, he shrank from recitations in which his inadequacies were publicly exposed.”¹⁸ To help him with his shyness and his studies, his mother asked her aunt,

Eliza Stuart, to tutor him. Eliza, however, was 80 years old and draconian in her approach to teaching. According to Pogue, Marshall learned to hate studying because of her, and he remarked, “She so soured me on study and teaching that I liked never to have recovered from it.”¹⁹ Following his experience with Eliza, his mother placed him in a private school, which required no homework or real study and thus provided no benefit to him. When Marshall was ten years old, his parents decided that it was time for him to enter public school, and it was at this time that both he and his father met with the school principal for an interview. Following his aforementioned embarrassment from this meeting, Marshall realized that he was comparatively ignorant and uneducated. This feeling of intellectual inferiority and physical awkwardness made him self-conscious, ashamed, and fearful of being laughed at by his peers.

Early embarrassments in education were difficult to surmount for Marshall. Because he had not been adequately prepared, he was categorized early-on in public schools as a slow learner. He was aware of his special status in classes, and like most students who get labeled as slow learners, this contributed to a disgruntled attitude that he developed for school. In fact, Ed Cray notes that “The fear of failure and thus rejection lay heavy on [Marshall].”²⁰ Despite an uneven beginning, Marshall progressively improved during his middle and high school years and had a strong interest in military history. As a youth, he considered Benjamin Franklin and Confederate Generals Robert E. Lee and Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson as heroes and leaders he always admired. In addition, his father often spoke about Marshall family history and service in the military, and it is likely that Marshall keyed on this as a way to bond with his father. His interest in military history served as an impetus and helped Marshall improve his performance in

school.

In fact, his renewed interest in education extended beyond high school, and he decided that he wanted to attend VMI, the college from which his older brother had recently graduated. This decision, oddly enough, was based not on his desire to further his study and understanding of military history. Instead, he had developed an interest in studying engineering and chemistry, and he learned from his brother that VMI taught these classes. Further, after hearing stories from Stuart, he knew exactly what he was getting into and looked forward to the experience. Stuart, however, did not want his brother to attend the same school that he attended and spoke privately with his mother to try and keep George out. Pogue mentions that Marshall overheard this conversation and that Marshall spoke of Stuart's intervention with unique intensity. Marshall heatedly recounted the following about this incident to Pogue during an interview,

When I was begging to go to VMI, I overheard Stuart talking to my mother; he was trying to persuade her not to let me go because he thought I would disgrace the family name. Well, that made more impression on me than all instructors, parental pressure, or anything else. I decided right then that I was going to wipe his eye. I did finally get ahead of what my brother had done. That was the first time I had ever done that, and it was where I really learned my lesson. The urgency to succeed came from hearing that conversation; it had a psychological effect on my career.²¹

This comment is quite revealing about what motivated Marshall to succeed. He no doubt felt betrayed by his brother and confused that he was trying to deny him an opportunity. To counter this, he made it his mission to surpass his brother's accomplishments at VMI. This reinforces Cray's contention that Marshall had a fear of failure and a need to prove his brother wrong. This may also explain why he developed a tireless work ethic in school and in the military. In addition, Marshall's motivation to surpass his brother and his fear of failure may also reflect his desperate need to receive recognition from his

father. Surpassing Stuart, whom Marshall believed was favored by his father, gave Marshall an opportunity to be both recognized and applauded by his father. Stuart's betrayal may also be the root cause of why Marshall carefully scrutinized each subordinate leader's sense of loyalty. He wanted to pick subordinates that he knew he could trust.

Marshall's entrance into VMI, however, was not forgone conclusion just because he wanted to prove his brother wrong. He still needed to take an entrance examination and was not academically strong enough to overcome this barrier. Despite this, Marshall seems to have avoided it altogether and instead relied on status as a legacy appointment to the school. Pogue points out that, "There is no record that George took any examination at all. He bore a great Virginian name (there were seven other Marshalls at VMI during the time he was there); his father had a solid local standing (the superintendent was always careful to address him as "Colonel"), and Stuart had made a satisfactory record."²² The irony is that Marshall needed his brother's record to help him gain entrance into VMI so that he could outperform and prove his brother wrong. His legacy appointment worked and he entered VMI in September 1897, the year prior to the Spanish-American War. Marshall's entrance into VMI demonstrated early his ability to maneuver politically and pull strings to get what he wanted.

VMI was what Marshall needed to expand his education and to develop his leadership skills. He worked hard for himself and to outperform his brother's record. He viewed his first year as a difficult but necessary part of life at VMI. First year students were called "plebes" or "rats" and were harshly treated by upper classmen. Marshall recalled instances such as being forced to sleep by open windows for the whole year.

This was especially difficult during winter months when snow apparently blew into his room and covered everything, which included him and his roommates while they slept.²³ He also mentioned upperclassmen on one occasion forcing him to hover above a naked bayonet as a test of endurance. He failed this test and was subsequently stabbed in the buttocks. After experiences such as these, it would be rational for graduates to dread hazing. However, when asked by Pogue about this, Marshall stated, “I think I was more philosophical about this sort of thing than a great many boys. It was part of the business and the only thing to do was to accept it as best you could.”²⁴ This comment by Marshall implies that rank and opportunity needed to be gained by going through this rite of passage.

Despite the hazing, Marshall enjoyed the drill and ceremony, tradition, and rich military history of VMI, especially the ubiquitous reminders of Confederate leaders and their successes during the Civil War. Pogue notes that “Marshall absorbed the lore of history and soldiering and profited by the discipline.”²⁵ In addition, Marshall made the following comments about his time at VMI, “What I learned at VMI was self-control, discipline, so that it was ground in. I learned also the problem of managing men.”²⁶ He was an average student academically throughout his four years at school, but he excelled in military leadership. Stoler points out that Marshall excelled at “drill, dress, self-control, discipline, and leadership.”²⁷ As a result, he was at the top of the list to make First Corporal, the highest rank of his class, at the start of his sophomore year. At the start of his junior year, he served as a First Sergeant and was later promoted to First Captain of the Corps of Cadets for his senior year. This was a coveted position and resoundingly indicates how instructors and peers viewed his leadership. Pogue notes that

“By solid recommendation of his tactical officers, and the four cadet captains, the adjutant, and the quartermaster, he was named first captain [sic] for his final year.”²⁸

Marshall made the following statement after receiving this position, “I tried very hard. I was very exacting and very exact in all my military duties as I gradually developed from the mild authority...exercised by the corporal to the pronounced authority of the first sergeant.” Stoler adds that Marshall achieved this rank because of “his self-control, his discipline, and perhaps most important, his leadership and ability to manage men.”²⁹

Another biographer, Robert Payne, also states that Marshall received this accolade “not for his brains but [for] his prowess as a precision machine.”³⁰ From this cursory glance at Marshall’s time at VMI, his leadership style seems to have been based on his desire to fulfill his duties, his need to maintain a disciplined lifestyle, a tireless work ethic, a desire to learn, and a genuine interest in subordinate mentorship.

It would not be fair to say, however, that Marshall was always disciplined, paid attention to exacting detail, or followed VMI rules precisely. For example, while a senior, Marshall met and fell in love with Elizabeth “Lily” Carter Coles. She was four years older than Marshall, had dated his brother Stuart and was known as a flirt. Nonetheless, Marshall was smitten with her and her southern charms. As a result, he risked all that he had worked so hard for at VMI to be with her during his free time. Despite being First Captain, Marshall broke VMI rules and sneaked off campus after hours to be with Lily. Pogue notes that this was called, “‘running the block’ or, in plain terms, ducking out of the Institute after hours.”³¹ He also points out that, if Marshall had been caught, then he would have at least lost his cadet rank and may have even been expelled. Pogue asked Marshall about this and Marshall gave the following brief reply,

“I was much in love.”³² He was not caught, however, and she eventually became his wife. This episode in his life is important to note because it demonstrates that he was willing to risk everything for something in which he believed. It also demonstrates that, as a Soldier in training, he did not always follow rules and regulations to the letter of the law. In fact, these actions by Marshall may have made him more of a leader in the eyes of his peers.

The respect he received from members of the corps and his accession in rank can be attributed to the fact that Marshall was able to channel his weaknesses into strengths. He turned his aloof and quiet persona into a perception that he was a methodical, contemplative, and exacting student when it came to troop leadership. His precision with details made him the resident expert on drill and ceremony and this earned him respect and that facilitated his accession into later leadership roles. In sum, Marshall found his niche at VMI, and he developed it to his benefit.

He was always interested in perfecting his leadership style and was likely motivated by American involvement in the Spanish-American War. He also may have thought that he was probably going to participate in repressing the Philippine Insurrection. He could thus justify that his training was soon to have real world significance for him. This war impacted him on a personal level because he knew people from Infantry Company C, a Pennsylvania National Guard unit from Uniontown, who had participated in this conflict and recently returned. In fact, upon witnessing a homecoming parade for this unit during the summer before his senior year, Marshall noted that this was his “first great emotional reaction [and it had] a determining effect on my choice of profession.”³³

Marshall completed his four years at VMI and gained tremendously from the experience. At graduation, he did not receive any academic honors, but he did finish fifth in civil engineering, his major, and eighth in military science. In addition, shortly after graduation he received a commission as a second lieutenant in the army. Obtaining a commission in the army after graduating VMI had previously been difficult, but because of the expansion of the army following the Spanish-American War, Marshall was able to receive one.

Eisenhower's Small Town Upbringing and Military Training at West Point

As with Marshall, the experiences Eisenhower had during his upbringing were the foundations for his leadership style. Although he was born in Denison, Texas, on October 14, 1890, he and his family relocated to Abilene, Kansas, before his first birthday. Abilene was a small town where, according to Eisenhower biographer Stephen E. Ambrose, “everyone worked, most of them at hard physical labor” and there was a strong sense of community.³⁴ Eisenhower's family lived a modest life in a small house by the railroad tracks in town. He was one of six boys in a respected, religiously focused, and hard working family. His father David, although financially unsuccessful, demonstrated the need for a strong work ethic and a disciplined lifestyle. While Eisenhower did not have a close relationship with his father, he loved, honored, and respected him and followed his rules. He had a closer relationship with his mother who reinforced his father's work ethic and disciplined lifestyle. Eisenhower's parents, according to Ambrose, “[T]aught the simple virtues of honesty, self-reliance, integrity, fear of God, and ambition.” Further, he states, “They wanted their sons to succeed in a wider setting than Abilene, or even Kansas. They gave the boys the feeling... ‘that if you

stay home you will always be looked upon as a boy.’’³⁵ Thus, the importance of a strong work ethic, adherence to the aforementioned virtues, and an understanding that success would only be achieved outside of Abilene gave Eisenhower an early direction in his life.

Also like Marshall, Ike’s experiences in school helped develop skills that later benefited him in the military. From an early age, he understood the importance of discipline and attention to detail, and he enjoyed competing mentally and physically. One of his earliest competitive events was an elementary spelling bee. This academic challenge gave him an opportunity to compete intellectually with others, and it taught him the importance of carefully studying something with great attention to detail. Although only an elementary school experience, Ambrose points out, “[It] aroused in him his competitive drive and his hatred of careless mistakes.”³⁶ In addition to spelling, he enjoyed mathematics, history, especially military history, and sports.

While in high school, Eisenhower was less concerned with academics than he was football and baseball, two sports that consumed his interests. Sports gave him an opportunity to gain acceptance with his peers and taught him how to lead. In fact, in order to improve competitive sports for his school, Eisenhower, while still a two-sport athlete, organized a game schedule with nearby schools and as Ambrose states, he “solved the problem of transportation to and from games by hustling his teammates onto freight trains for a free ride [to away games.]”³⁷ In addition, because funds for school sports were so limited, he and a few other students, in their senior year, organized the Abilene High School Athletic Association, which subsequently and unanimously elected Eisenhower as its first president. According to Eisenhower biographer Alton Lee, “The association raised funds by contributions, stimulated student support for the teams during

contests, and, directed by [Eisenhower's] energy and enthusiasm, promoted a successful sports season that year."³⁸ In a small town like Abilene, Eisenhower's stand out athletic skills and leadership abilities surely made him a recognized young man. However, admiration and leadership in a small town community was not what he had been brought up to consider as successful. Like his older brothers, he planned on leaving Abilene to pursue his future.

After graduating from high school, he and his brother Edgar planned on attending the University of Michigan because they wanted a great education "and an opportunity to play college football and baseball."³⁹ He agreed to help Edgar get established at Michigan and attend school for two years. He would work in Abilene for two years to support Edgar, and then at the end of two years, he would attend Michigan and Edgar would reciprocate the support. However, a year later, Ike met and became friends with Everett "Swede" Hazlett, a young man his age who had attended St. Andrew's Military Academy in Wisconsin and was planning on attending the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.⁴⁰ Eisenhower found Swede's comments about military life and a military education intriguing, and this lifestyle was a natural fit for Eisenhower's interests. In the Naval Academy, he could live a virtuous life outside of Abilene, and he could participate in sports. In addition, by attending this school he could be part of an institution that advocated a strong work ethic, promoted attention to detail, and was part of American history, one of his academic interests. Additionally, the Naval Academy provided a free college education, adventure, and a secure job after graduation. Although he was interested in this option, getting accepted to the Naval Academy was not easy, even for bright and talented students. Unlike Marshall, however, he applied and, in the

fall of 1910, he took an entrance exam and scored the second highest out of eight other candidates in the state of Kansas. His score was adequate to gain entrance into the Naval Academy, but he was denied entrance because he was too old; however, he was not too old for West Point. Because West Point offered the same benefits as the Naval Academy, Eisenhower accepted admission and he left enthusiastically the following fall.

Ike's experiences at West Point clearly helped develop his military leadership style. At the end of four years, he learned how to channel the virtuous lifestyle he lived in his youth, his natural leadership abilities, and his interest in learning into effective military leadership skills. Considering the excellent leadership he demonstrated during World War II, what did Eisenhower learn at West Point that helped define his leadership style? This is a challenging question, considering his grades and his disciplinary record indicate he did not demonstrate leadership abilities that the West Point curriculum was designed to produce. As his later academic successes at the Army's Command and General Staff College indicate, he was not unintelligent. He just did not like to be confined by rules and regulations that he thought were overbearing. Also, like Marshall, Eisenhower broke academy rules and regulations and did not always adhere to academy traditions. In fact, as Ambrose points out, "Of the 164 men in his class who graduated, he stood 125th in discipline."⁴¹ This is not to say that he did not live a virtuous lifestyle as a cadet, he did, but he also acted as any other typical young adult male would who was going through some of the mundane idiosyncrasies of cadet life at West Point. His infractions were really more an act of defiance against overbearing administrative measures and had the unintended effect of making him an informal leader among his peers.

One of the traditions he did not observe was hazing plebes and other underclassmen, something he did not like when he was a plebe. According to Ambrose, after Eisenhower hazed his first plebe, he remarked, “I’m never going to crawl [haze] another plebe as long as I live. As a matter of fact, they’ll have to run over and knock me out of the company street before I’ll make any attempt again.” Further, Ambrose states, “Eisenhower’s reaction to the incident typified his four years at the academy. He took from West Point what was positive and rejected that which was negative.”⁴² One means of teaching determination, discipline, attention to detail, and esprit de corps among plebes is through hazing; it is not intended to be malicious or sadistic. Ike’s refusal to engage in this activity demonstrates that he believed there was a better way to develop young leaders than through the time-honored tradition of hazing. By itself, this is a glimpse of his leadership style and an example of his adherence to the virtuous lifestyle in which he was raised. This view by Eisenhower is also in stark contrast to how Marshall viewed hazing at VMI. He saw it simply as another facet of his educational experience at VMI and something that needed to be endured. Nonetheless, both saw the need to develop fledgling officers in military schools, but they just differed in their approach to achieve that end.

In addition to disregarding tradition, Eisenhower, like Marshall, disobeyed academy rules. As an upperclassman, he was not afraid to occasionally break regulations that he thought were ridiculous or overbearing. In fact, according to Ambrose, he “looked with distaste on classmates whose days and nights were haunted by fear of demerits and low grades.”⁴³ Ike was not ashamed of his rebellious actions at the academy and some of his fondest memories were of pranks he engaged in while there.

One rule he frequently broke was the academy's rule against smoking. Despite causing uneasiness to his roommates, Ike routinely smoked in his room and just as routinely completed disciplinary actions for his transgressions. In another example, Ambrose describes one of Ike's fondest memories at the academy, a memory about a prank he and another cadet pulled on an upperclassman. As part of a disciplinary action, he and the other cadet were ordered to report to the correcting upperclassman in "full-dress coat" uniform. As ordered, they reported to the upperclassman wearing only their dress coats and no other piece of clothing. This prank got him and the other cadet into even more trouble, but he gained popular appeal. According to Ambrose, Eisenhower did this to point out the "absurd literalness of the regulations and orders."⁴⁴ To be clear, Eisenhower's disregard and subsequent confrontation of the rules at West Point is more significant in describing his leadership style than Marshall's occasional disregard for VMI's after hours closed campus rule. True enough, both broke the rules, but Eisenhower not only broke them, he cynically and sometimes sarcastically confronted them and, as a result, gained recognition from his peers as an informal leader. Marshall was formally viewed and rewarded as a leader because he was precise in his drill and ceremony not because he sometimes challenged authority or rules.

Although his academic and discipline records indicate that he was an average and sometimes below average cadet, Eisenhower's rebellious behavior demonstrated his leadership abilities. His minor transgressions made him a popular cadet and provided him with allies and admiration from his classmates. In addition, thinking and behaving outside established tradition and rules provided Ike the opportunity to think independently and view situations from a wider perspective. Eisenhower biographer Fred

I. Greenstein commented on this, stating,

His manners as a West Point cadet who received an above average quota of demerits for violating the academy rules...prefigures the career soldier who regularly obeyed the letter of rules but found ways of solving problems informally when ritualistic conformity would have stalled or halted him in attaining his goals.⁴⁵

Ike's disciplinary problems did not end with his experience at West Point. On his official military service record, when he was a major, he was given a reprimand for signing vouchers for quarters when he was not entitled.⁴⁶ It is not clear why he did this, but it is likely a minor administrative oversight.

Is it possible, therefore, to infer from both Marshall and Eisenhower's behavior that, in order to be a good military leader, it is sometimes necessary to not follow the letter of the law. Perhaps permitting minor transgressions, not of an ethical nature, which result in menial punishments, is an important part of developing a Soldier's leadership style that is both realistic and practical in the military. It certainly makes leaders more human in the eyes of those whom they lead. At the very least, this type of behavior helps leaders develop the ability to make rational, common sense types of judgments that demonstrate a leadership style that is based on doctrinal procedures and a fair evaluation instead of simply executing what is stipulated alone in doctrine.

Despite his disciplinary problems at West Point, Eisenhower developed a strong understanding of military science. Eisenhower biographers Chester J. Pach, Jr. and Elmo Richardson noted that, "[E]ven though Eisenhower generally did not excel in the classroom or on the training field, he left West Point steeped in the canons of professional officership. He learned to value not individual heroics or personal glory, but teamwork – disciplined and efficient management of the tasks of modern war."⁴⁷ One way Ike

developed a strong appreciation for the benefits of teamwork in military endeavors was through his involvement in athletics at West Point.

While at West Point, Ike developed into an exceptional football player, who, following a game against Rutgers University got national recognition for his athletic prowess. However, his football career was cut short by a serious knee injury, which, even after healing, continued to aggravate him throughout his life. The impact of this injury cannot be understated. It changed his life pursuits and enabled him to develop new leadership skills. Since he was unable to play football again, he turned his efforts to supporting the team as a cheerleader. This change of focus helped him develop speaking skills in front of large crowds, which is an important skill for leaders.

As a result of his public exposure and knowledge about football, he was offered a junior varsity coaching position. As presidential historian James David Barber points out, “[Coaching] contributed to Eisenhower’s style as a coordinator of action, demonstrating to a man who had been deprived of his ability to do the main thing he wanted to do that he could serve by organizing others to succeed in it.”⁴⁸ Coaching a football team that was organized into offensive and defensive platoons gave Ike an early opportunity to develop platoon leadership skills before receiving his commission. “The act of coaching brought out his best traits,” Ambrose states, “his organizational ability, his energy and competitiveness, his enthusiasm and optimism, his willingness to work hard at a task that intrigued him, his powers of concentration, his talent for working with the material he had instead of hoping for what he did not have, and his gift for drawing the best out of his players.”⁴⁹ Eisenhower’s leadership style is closely connected to his coaching experience, and it is evident throughout his military career. An early example

of his application of coaching skills to military leadership is apparent when he was the commander at Camp Colt near Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in 1918. At this camp, Barber states, “He learned to pick men, to get them working together, to coax – and coach- ten thousand men and six hundred officers into doing their duty.” Further, Barber states, “The style was a coach’s style; the Eisenhower world view, sketched in his adolescence, was further deepened by later experience.”⁵⁰ Later in his military career, Ambrose states that, “In his private talks with his corps and division commanders, and in his Orders of the Day, Supreme Commander Eisenhower used football slang extensively, urging his men to ‘pull an end run’ and ‘hit the line’ and ‘break through’ and ‘get that ball across the goal line.’”⁵¹ It was natural for him to apply athletic principles to his sense of military leadership. Besides athletics, it is also important to examine how religion played a role in Marshall’s and Eisenhower’s lives, as well as how it impacted their leadership styles.

The Importance of Religion in Leadership

The impact of religion in a person’s life is profound and helps shape how people view themselves and the world, and how they understand what is right and wrong. Understanding, adhering, and practicing the tenets of one’s faith is a personal experience that unquestionably shapes how people go about their lives and interact with others. Judeo-Christian beliefs, for example, shape the laws that govern the United States, and thus it can be argued that these beliefs impact Americans every day. These same beliefs and laws shape the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), which is the legal code for members of the armed services. Because it is therefore a facet of American life and life in the military, religion must be seriously considered by leaders and how it factors into their leadership style, and it should also be considered in officer leadership development.

In addition, American military leaders should lead by example and demonstrate that they live virtuous and morally focused lives in order to guide those they lead. When these leaders live a virtuous and morally focused life based on religion, they provide their subordinates with a beacon to follow. In fact, they are really setting the example for all Americans to follow. As a result, leaders should encourage those they lead to practice their faith formally by attending religious services or informally through private prayer during times of both war and peace. However, there are a few obvious questions about how leaders use religion to develop their leadership styles. For example, how much should leaders employ religion in the decisions they make? Also, how is faith and morality imparted by military leaders to their subordinates without coming across to them as preaching? Is it done formally or through mentoring?

In her monograph, *The Pentagon's Battle for the American Mind*, Lori Lyn Bogle provides numerous examples of how the military has indoctrinated Soldiers about morality and faith in an effort to guide Soldiers in a virtuous lifestyle and therefore protect the American way of life. She begins by providing examples indicating that General George Washington employed civil-military religion to Continental Soldiers during the harsh winter at Valley Forge in 1777-78 to provide religious indoctrination.⁵² Based on this, she builds her case that the military adopted Washington's lead and has a long established practice of teaching morality and faith to Soldiers because citizen Soldiers are the foundation of America's national character. She notes that Washington "fostered righteousness by encouraging private morality among troops through religious instruction and his own personal example. ...He also directed the army's chaplains to incorporate revolutionary ideology into the mandatory prayer services." She also adds

that Washington, “through his own self-imposed discipline...-by curbing his anger, vanity, ambition for personal glory, wenching[sic], gambling, and cursing-intentionally shaped his public persona to that of the American Cincinnatus, a model of civic and personal virtue upon which his officers and men could pattern their own behavior.”⁵³ Therefore, Washington established an unchangeable identity of the American military as the sentinel of national morality. He also provided the historical reference, which leaders after him needed to reference to incorporate religion in their leadership style. Bogle further notes that,

Morale, considered by the military to be ‘the rational and emotional attitudes that motivate and sustain soldiers,’ was of vital importance to the development of disciplined, obedient troops. Difficult to define precisely and virtually impossible to measure, the armed forces attempted to increase morale of the ‘will to fight’ through a variety of means, including civil-military religion.⁵⁴

This leadership style provided by Washington was clearly present in the leadership styles of both Marshall and Eisenhower. Both were devout Christians and both understood that leaders needed to provide civil-military religious guidance to those they led. In addition, both realized that religion helped Soldiers improve their morale, which subsequently helped Soldiers stay focused on their duties. This also led to better disciplined troops who were more apt to live up to their roles as sentinels of national morality.

The Importance of Religion in Marshall’s Leadership Style

Marshall was indoctrinated in civil-military religion when he served in the military. There is not doubt that he deliberately included his faith as a facet of his leadership. By examining Marshall’s upbringing and his feelings and attitudes toward his faith, it is possible to see how his religious views impacted his leadership style. As mentioned earlier, Marshall was baptized and raised in the Episcopalian faith, and he

maintained a close relationship with his minister. As a youth, he also volunteered at St. Peter's Episcopal Church as the organist's assistant. His support to the organist, however, was cut short because he spent more time playing than helping out. Nonetheless, going to church was a weekly occurrence for the Marshalls. It is clear that religion played a role in Marshall's life and that included the time he spent in the army. In fact, his devotion to his faith is unmistakably present in his speeches, and it is therefore evident that it was prominently on his mind.

Because it played a role in how he thought, it is necessary to discuss some of the basic tenets of the Episcopalian faith in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This faith is directly connected to the Church of England and therefore members of this faith are sometimes referred to as Anglicans. According to Leo Rosten, Episcopalians and Anglicans "are rooted in their common ancestry; their full communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury and with one another; their prayer books, which establish the body of common faith; and their increasing common action in many relationships."⁵⁵ It is, therefore, a Christian, Protestant faith and those that follow this faith hold the following basic beliefs: they believe in the Trinity; they are affirmed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; they take Holy Communion; they believe death is a state of being, which marks the end of life, and that each person is judged by God on his character when they die; they believe heaven is also a state of being, but recognize that those that sin will spend some time purifying (purgatory concept) before they enter heaven; and they believe that, since people sin, it is important to have a fellowship with God in Christ to lead a healthy and whole life.⁵⁶ Marshall devotedly practiced this faith.

The importance of religion for Marshall is clear in a speech he gave to the citizens

of Uniontown when he was the Chief of Staff of the Army, just prior to America's participation in World War II. In this speech, he considered the difficult days ahead and summed his comments with the following statement, "It comes to me that we should daily thank the good Lord that we live where we do, think as we do, and enjoy blessings that are becoming rare privileges on this earth."⁵⁷ Based on his comments, it is apparent religion was part of his daily consideration and therefore had an impact on his leadership style.

In another even more telling speech he delivered at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, on June 15, 1941, he discussed his soul and the souls of men and then connected that to the concept of morale for Soldiers. He stated in the speech, "If I were back in my office I would not have referred to my soul. Instead I should have used the word "morale" and said that this occasion increased my "morale" – in other words, was of spiritual benefit to me."⁵⁸ He then went on to say that morale was a French word, and that it was in widespread usage in all the armies of the world. He mentioned that morale was a concept that was closely connected to a Soldier's spiritual strength, courage, and hope. He added that "it is élan, esprit de corps, and determination." From this he also made the following profound statement, "The [S]oldier's heart, the [S]oldier's spirit, the [S]oldier's soul are everything. Unless the [S]oldier's soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end."⁵⁹ He also stated, "I am also acknowledging that the determining factor in war is something invisible and intangible, something wholly spiritual."⁶⁰ Marshall later elaborated that the soul of a Soldier reflects the character of the Soldier, and this must be shaped. He then went on to describe how the army, which he was in charge of at the time, was changing and teaching

Soldiers to use their minds and to consider their spiritual well being. This alone is indicative of his mind set. Finally, toward the conclusion of this speech, Marshall offered the following profound civil religious comment,

This new discipline enables me to leave with you the assurance that the men in this Army we are building for the defense of a Christian nation and Christian values, will fight, if they have to fight, with more than their bodies and their hands and their material weapons. They will fight with their souls in the job to do.⁶¹

He also talked about how America's Christian army was increasing the number of chaplains in uniform and the significantly increasing the number of chapels on army posts. Further, in a radio broadcasted message on November 29, 1940, Marshall made the following comment regarding the spiritual well being of Soldiers, "There should be no fear that any young man will suffer spiritual loss during the period of his military service, and on the contrary, we hope that the young [S]oldier will return to his home with a keener understanding of the sacred ideals for which our churches stand."⁶²

Marshall's comments are clearly indicative of the way he viewed the army, and how he viewed the army he wanted to build for the future. It is also clear that he actively worked to expand the influence of Christianity in the army by expanding the number of chaplains and chapels. The role religion played in his leadership style is evident on this alone, but it really goes much deeper. As mentioned earlier, understanding right from wrong and how that applies to the UCMJ is important for leaders to consider. Leaders have a major influence regarding how Soldiers in their charge are disciplined, and this must be tied to how religion factors into their views of right and wrong. Therefore, Marshall's comments about the souls of Soldiers and how this concept ties to character must be considered in this context. He was a civil-military religious leader who was harsh with Soldiers who were guilty of immoral, non Christian behaviors. Soldiers acting

as such certainly would not fit into the Christian army he outlined in his speech. His religious beliefs also had an influence on how he helped develop the characters of the Soldiers that he led. For example, it had an impact on the speeches that he gave about duty, discipline, honor, courage, *esprit-de-corps*, and especially on how he conveyed to Soldiers that they needed to be of sound character for the benefit of their country. Bogle notes that Marshall extended the influence of religion in the military when in 1951, while he served as the Secretary of Defense, he created and initiated the Character Guidance Program. She notes that Marshall ordered “commanding officers to increase their efforts to improve the spiritual morale of their personnel.”⁶³ As she also highlights, this resulted in chaplains interviewing each recruit “to determine their spiritual status and to inform them of the religious activities available.” She further notes that, “If a recruit had not been baptized before he enlisted, the chaplain ‘strongly’ encouraged the man to enroll in religious instruction classes held in the evenings or on Sunday afternoons to help him complete this Christian sacrament.”⁶⁴

These efforts by Marshall acting as Secretary of Defense undeniably demonstrate that he was a military leader focused on leading with a style steeped in religious ideology. He thought this way because World Wars I and II taught him that America fought wars as a force of good against evil. In his later role as Secretary of Defense, Marshall also understood that America was again pitted against the evil of communism, and he recognized America’s need to again stop this threat. Indeed, it is evident that he recognized and wanted to perpetuate the early Puritan chosen nation theme that Americans were God’s chosen people and that America was a New Israel, a “city upon on a hill,” and a beacon for others to see.⁶⁵ He also apparently identified with

Washington's American Cincinnatus example and wanted civil-military religion to be a significant facet of Army life. In addition, his profound religious views about the army are also indicative of a leader who viewed his role as an American and as a defender of the Constitution in a religious way akin to how other early Americans such as John Winthrop, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams viewed themselves. The strong role that religion played in Marshall's leadership is equally evident in Eisenhower's leadership style.

The Importance of Religion in Eisenhower's Leadership Style

Eisenhower was raised with a strong understanding that religion needed to play a vital role in his life. He, too, was a leader who incorporated civil-military religion in his leadership style. Both of his parents had a Pennsylvania German family history, and both of them believed in the River Brethren faith. Now called Brethren in Christ, this faith was established some time between 1775 and 1788 in an area just West of Philadelphia and along the Susquehanna River. It is a Protestant faith that was established just after the Great Awakening, and it stresses a person's personal connection with God and Christ that is heartfelt rather than a faith based on an intellectual understanding as such practiced by Episcopalians. Followers of this faith are Anabaptist and pietistic and believe that baptism is a personal experience, and therefore is something that adults, rather than children, should experience once they understand, accept, and agree to live their lives as Christians.⁶⁶ While both parents practiced this faith, Eisenhower's mother was much more devout and insisted that her family have established religious practices.

According to religious historians Richard V. Pierard and Robert D. Linder, "Religion played a fairly significant role in the home life of the Eisenhower family.

Family worship was held twice a day which included Bible readings as a regular feature, and the parents shunned vices like smoking, drinking, swearing, card playing, and gambling.”⁶⁷ Unfortunately, Eisenhower sometimes indulged in these vices while he was an officer and to a greater extent when he was in public office. Nonetheless, having an upbringing in which religious worship was done twice a day certainly illustrated a family life devoted to religion. In addition, Ambrose points out, “Eisenhower’s home life revolved around worship. Every day, morning, and night, the family members got down on their knees to pray. David read from the Bible before meals, [and] then asked for a blessing.”⁶⁸ Following meals, the family would gather in a small living room and again read from the Bible. Eisenhower’s brother also once stated that, “We always prayed. It was just as natural for us to pray, to call upon God for help as it was for us to get up and eat breakfast.”⁶⁹

Despite the strong influence of the River Brethren faith in their family life, for some reason, they turned away from this faith and decided to join the Jehovah’s Witnesses faith. According to Pierard and Linder, “his mother joined Jehovah’s Witnesses, and his father eventually followed her into the sect, but with little enthusiasm.”⁷⁰ This transition of faith occurred when Eisenhower was ten years old, and it is not clear how connected he was to this new faith. Practitioners of both faiths believe that baptism is for adults and not children, both are deeply connected to a clear understanding of the Bible, and both are against war and thus recognized as pacifists. Despite these similarities, there are differences in regard to their beliefs about heaven, hell, sin, and redemption. For example, the River Brethren were less intellectually interested in understanding the Bible than they were about feeling a heartfelt connection

with God and Christ about what was stipulated in the Bible. How deeply this change impacted Eisenhower throughout the rest of his life is unclear. Nonetheless, his mother gave him a Bible when he graduated from West Point, and she highlighted 2 Chronicles, 7:14. This passage was important enough to him that he had his hand over this passage when he took his oath of office as President of the United States on January 20, 1953.⁷¹ Certainly he was a religious person, and this is obvious during both his time in the army and as the President of the United States.

While in the army, Eisenhower attended service at post chapels wherever he was stationed. The influence of religion in his leadership style is evident in many of the comments he made in uniform. For example, Eisenhower made the following comment regarding the decision to begin the amphibious landings in Normandy, France,

If there were nothing else in my life to prove the existence of an almighty and merciful God, the events of the next twenty-four hours did it. This is what I found out about religion. It gives you courage to make the decisions you must make in a crisis, and then the confidence to leave the result to higher power. Only by trust in one's self and trust in God can a man carrying responsibility find repose.⁷²

This comment is revealing about how he connected faith and leadership. He believed, essentially, that there comes a time when leaders must have faith in God. If leaders are righteous men and live honorably and according to the teachings of God, then when they are confronted with a leadership decision that requires the courage to trust a higher power, they will find the strength and confidence in God to make the right decision for themselves and those that they lead. Pierard and Linder note that in World War II when Eisenhower was asked by troops about why they were fighting in the war, he would provide the following religious response,

I believe that every soldier...seeking to find within his own soul some reason for being on the battlefield, for enduring the things he has to endure there, has in the long run got to fix this relationship [to the service of God] in his won mind if he is to be really a soldier who can carry forward the terrible load that devolves upon him in those circumstances.⁷³

This comment by Eisenhower clearly shows how religion impacted his leadership style, and how he directly led and inspired Soldiers during World War II.

When interviewed just after World War II, he stated that he was “the most intensely religious man I know. Nobody goes through six years of war without faith.”⁷⁴ Also, as is evident in his comments to troops in battle, he truly felt that he and those that he led were enduring the tragedy of war because it was a war between good and evil.

Eisenhower believed that the Axis powers were truly evil, and that he was leading a crusading effort to crush evil so that good could prevail; in fact, he even titled his war memoirs, *Crusade in Europe*. According to Pierard and Linder, Eisenhower wanted his men to believe that they “were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Axis tyranny, and freedom was a value derived from their status as children of God.”⁷⁵ In his memoirs, the following passage clearly shows his belief that he was leading a religious crusade against evil:

Daily as it progressed there grew within me the conviction that as never before in a war between nations the forces that stood for human good and men’s rights were this time confronted by a completely evil conspiracy with which no compromise could be tolerated. Because only the utter destruction of the Axis was a decent world possible, the war became for me a crusade in the traditional sense of that often misused word.⁷⁶

Further, at a speech he gave in 1952 when he was president-elect, he stated, “Our form of government has no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious [Judeo-Christian] faith.”⁷⁷

Certainly, Eisenhower’s deeply religious views impacted how he handled

discipline for his troops, how he spoke with them, and how he guided them in war. Like Marshall, Eisenhower had a civil-military religious focus, and he believed that Soldiers needed to be led knowing that they were fighting a righteous, Christian fight, and that they were in a crusade against evil. He cared about his soul and the souls of his men, and he therefore served his men as both a military leader and a spiritual pastor. He instilled in his men an understanding of what was right and wrong, and he helped them to live righteous, Christian lives so that they could win a crusade against evil.

Although not a facet of this thesis, it is nonetheless worth briefly noting the impact of religion on Eisenhower's leadership while he served two terms as the President of the United States. He carried his deeply held religious beliefs into his presidency and helped all Americans see their crusade against the evils of Communism. In his inaugural address on January 20, 1953, his comments were replete with civil religious rhetoric and demonstrated, according to Pierard and Linder, an "affirmation of faith in free government under God and a call for spiritual rededication and moral renewal." In fact, a week and half after making his inaugural address, he made it a point to stress his religious conviction when on February 1, 1953, he "presented himself for baptism and membership in the National Presbyterian Church." His wife, Mame, was a Presbyterian, and he decided to change faiths, and thus he became the first President baptized while in office.⁷⁸ He also was the President who had "In God We Trust" added as the national motto and also had the words "under God" added to the Pledge of Allegiance.

NOTES

¹ Forrest C. Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939* (New York: Viking Press, 1963), 15.

² Ibid., 14.

³ Ibid., 15.

⁴ Mark A. Stoler, *George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the American Century* (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1989), 3.

⁵ Stoler, 3-5, and Pogue, *Education of a General*, 13-15.

⁶ Stoler, 4. The following information was obtained from the Geocities website and the author is unknown (<http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/4547/frick.html>): Henry Clay Frick was born in 1849 in West Overton, Pennsylvania. In 1871 he organized the H. C. Frick Coke Co. Coke was an important ingredient in the manufacture of steel, and the region in which Frick organized, the Connellsville Coke region, produced a very high quality. In 1873 a financial panic allowed Frick to acquire other companies and ally himself with the Carnegie Steel Co., as well as become a millionaire by the age of 30. Frick merged his coke interests with Andrew Carnegie's interests for the benefit of both. He was chairman of the Board of the resulting Carnegie Steel Company from 1889 to 1900. In 1892, the famous Homestead Steel Strike occurred, costing the lives of many people and setting the labor movement back decades. The violence was largely due to Frick's harsh labor policies, which caused him to bring in armed Pinkerton guards to try to break the strike. Shortly after the Homestead strike, an anarchist, Alexander Berkman, attempted to assassinate Henry Clay Frick in Frick's downtown Pittsburgh office.

⁷ Ibid., 4-5.

⁸ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 24.

⁹ Ibid., 27.

¹⁰ Ibid., 24.

¹¹ Stoler, 5.

¹² Pogue, *Education of a General*, 21.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 27.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., 28.

- ¹⁷ Stoler, 5.
- ¹⁸ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 19.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., 19-20.
- ²⁰ Ed Cray. *General of the Army: George C. Marshall, Soldier and Statesman* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1990), 21.
- ²¹ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 41.
- ²² Ibid., 41-2.
- ²³ Ibid., 43.
- ²⁴ Ibid., 44.
- ²⁵ Ibid., 46.
- ²⁶ Ibid., 46-7.
- ²⁷ Stoler, 9.
- ²⁸ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 53.
- ²⁹ Stoler, 9-10.
- ³⁰ Rober Payne, *The Marshall Story: A Biography of General George C. Marshall* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951), 9.
- ³¹ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 56.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Ibid., 53.
- ³⁴ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990), 16.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 17.
- ³⁶ Ibid.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 20.
- ³⁸ Alton Lee, *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Soldier and Statesman* (Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishing, Inc., 1981), 18.

- ³⁹ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 21.
- ⁴⁰ The United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland (hereafter, Naval Academy).
- ⁴¹ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 25.
- ⁴² Ibid., 23.
- ⁴³ Ibid., 25.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., 26.
- ⁴⁵ Fred I. Greenstein, *The Hidden-Hand Presidency: Eisenhower as Leader* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 246.
- ⁴⁶ Department of the Army (DA) 201 Personnel File, *Pre-Presidential Papers (1916-1952), Principal File* (hereafter PPP, PF), Box 4 (Abilene, KS: Dwight D. Eisenhower Library (hereafter DDEL)).
- ⁴⁷ Chester J. Pach, Jr., and Elmo Richardson, *The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 3.
- ⁴⁸ James David Barber, *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance In The White House* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992), 191.
- ⁴⁹ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 27.
- ⁵⁰ Barber, 191.
- ⁵¹ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 27.
- ⁵² Lori Lyn Bogle, *The Pentagon's Battle for the American Mind* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press, 2004), 4-7.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., 18-19.
- ⁵⁵ Leo Rosten, *Religions of America: Ferment and Faith in an Age of Crisis, A new Guide and Almanac* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975), 97.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., 96-111.
- ⁵⁷ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 349.

⁵⁸ George C. Marshall, *Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall: Chief of Staff, United States Army* (Washington, DC: The Infantry Journal, 1945), 121.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 122.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 123.

⁶¹ Ibid., 124.

⁶² Ibid., 93.

⁶³ Bogle, 71.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 71-72.

⁶⁵ Richard V. Pierard and Robert D. Linder, *Civil Religion & the Presidency* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1988), 48-54. The following is a passage from Pierard and Linder (p. 50) regarding John Winthrop's "City Upon A Hill" speech: "[Puritans] were involved in a mission of cosmic significance. They were the test case which would determine whether people could live on earth in a civil state according to the will of God. In old England the Puritans were being frustrated in their effort to bring the Reformation to a logical and successful conclusion, but now they had the opportunity to do so in New England. Their outpost in the wilderness could be a "city upon a hill," a moral and political example for the entire world. Their Zion would be the hub of the universe, whose light and wisdom would radiate in all directions for the good of humanity and the glory of God. This belief became a part of the ideology of Puritan New England and eventually of most Americans."

⁶⁶ This information was paraphrased from the History tab on the Brethren in Christ Internet Website at the following address: <http://www.bic-church.org/about/history.asp>).

⁶⁷ Pierard and Linder, 185.

⁶⁸ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 16.

⁶⁹ Bela Kornitzer, *The Great American Heritage: The Story of the Five Eisenhower Brothers* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1955), 26.

⁷⁰ Pierard and Linder, 186.

⁷¹ Pierard and Linder, 202. *The New Testament Bible*, 2 Chronicles, 7:14, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways: then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

⁷² Ibid., 193.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Pierard and Linder, 185, 327. Dwight D. Eisenhower (hereafter DDE) made this statement in a press conference at Columbia University on May 4, 1948.

⁷⁵ Pierard and Linder, 194.

⁷⁶ DDE, *Crusade in Europe* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1948), 157.

⁷⁷ Bogle, 80.

⁷⁸ Pierard and Linder, 203.

CHAPTER 3

LEADERSHIP PHILOSOPHIES AND OFFICER MENTORSHIP

The military leadership styles of these two fine army officers are refreshing when viewed through the lens of how today's military leaders guide their troops and the future of the army. Both men spoke frankly and were meticulous thinkers and practitioners of their craft. They were not geniuses, and both would admit that. They were, however, truly absorbed with perfecting their understanding of how the army worked, how they could best lead men, and how they could shape the future of the army. As mentioned earlier, they both had challenges in the military institutions they attended, Eisenhower more than Marshall to be sure. Also, both broke school rules, and both could have been expelled for their transgressions. Even so, they were not afraid to take risks. In fact, their willingness to take risks in this type of setting likely demonstrated their leadership abilities to their peers. This perception, as well as their abilities to focus on military tasks they were given, enabled both men to be viewed as leaders.

After they graduated from their respective military institutions, both were able to utilize their leadership abilities toward future successes. Influential senior officers soon recognized their abilities and what they could contribute to the army. Thus, because both had demonstrated leadership abilities during and after formal military schooling, both had the opportunity to receive quality mentoring and this, undeniably, helped guide their careers. That is not to say that advancement is exclusively based on who a person knows, but rather that these men benefited from influential officers, but only because they had first demonstrated their leadership abilities. Once both proved their abilities, their military careers were guided and protected by those senior officers who recognized their

talents. This was a facet of the army for both Marshall and Eisenhower, and it is still a facet of army life today. In effect, this is advancement through a system of cronyism. Success in this type of environment usually involves, at least in the military, demonstrated competence in a job and the ability to politically maneuver for rank and position. The premise of cronyism is that those in the position to guide a career must have been successful, and thus, those that they like or think have talent likely have the same skills they had. Clearly this is not always the case. Marshall and Eisenhower, however, benefited from this system. Both had unique leadership styles and both were effective leaders in the military.

Marshall's Military Leadership Style

Marshall was a leader and those that worked with him and for him immediately recognized his leadership abilities. Pogue notes that he had “the aura of authority” and this became especially obvious when he served as the Chief of Staff. He also adds that Marshall had “A mastery of his profession, born of extreme hard work and dedication rather than striking power of intellect, [that] impressed all who worked with him.” In addition, Marshall was also known for having integrity. Pogue points out that Marshall had “a disdain for false speaking and dissembling and an unwillingness to become a pawn of any man.” He also adds that Dean Acheson once stated that “The thing that stands out in everybody’s recollection of General Marshall is the immensity of his integrity.”¹

Because he spoke bluntly, however, Marshall was known for not making close friendships. He was often considered cold, aloof, quiet, and intense when making his point. He was methodical and analytical, and he expected officers to be duty bound,

disciplined, hard working, and focused on getting the job done and to the best of their abilities. Also, he did not like briefings by officers that were too long, unclear, and self-serving. Further, he expected officers to be able to think critically, clearly, and to provide answers to his questions that were articulate, concise, and without concern for what they thought he wanted to hear. He did not mind profanity in their responses, so long as it was genuine and merited in discussion.

Marshall was also demanding of his subordinates. Like his father and Pershing, he expected perfection from subordinate officers, and if an officer met Marshall's challenges he would support him, if not, Marshall would permanently cut all ties. According to Puryear, a former staff officer to Marshall, Colonel Paul Ransom, once stated that Marshall,

Sacrificed toleration for perfection, the spirit [of the law] for the letter [of the law], the trivia for the immediate end; in other words it was either 'white' or 'black'; ruling out completely any shade of grey...he expected his subordinates to be right all the time; the subordinate might be right many times and then err; he was then finished.²

During Marshall's time as Chief of Staff, this type of leadership style was likely viewed as overly harsh. Nonetheless, officers that received tasks from Marshall knew that he took his responsibilities in the army seriously, they knew what he expected of them, and they also knew that if they performed well that they would receive this support in the future.

Marshall viewed the army in definitive white and black terms, and this made decisions easier for him. For him, Soldiers were either right or they were wrong, there were no in-between positions, vagueness in arguments, or gray areas to be considered. Those that worked for him knew this, and this likely made them brief him in those same

definitive terms. This probably had the effect of forcing staff members to carefully consider things in definitive terms rather than in waffling uncertainties. When it came to definitive white and black types of decisions, Jack Uldrich notes that, “George Marshall was a man of integrity and always demonstrated moral courage. If a matter came down to ‘doing something right’ or doing the right thing,’ he always chose the latter.”³ Thus, the definitive answer was always nested in what Marshall perceived as the right thing to do, and as mentioned in the previous chapter, he perceived this on his religious views. This is important to keep in mind, considering that Marshall believed he was shaping the army to be a Christian army.

In addition to challenging subordinates and seeing things in definitive white and black, right from wrong terms, Marshall also believed that leaders should speak their minds with their superiors in a frank yet respectful manner. It is not exactly clear if he developed this aspect of his leadership style in conversations he had with his parents, or if it was something he developed at VMI. Wherever he learned this leadership skill, it benefited him throughout his career. In fact, Marshall believed in speaking bluntly and avoided those that could not be direct and concise in conversation. Uldrich points out that, “it could be argued that Marshall’s candor played an instrumental-if not integral-role in his career.”⁴ For example, in his first encounter with Pershing, he spoke frankly and provided him unsolicited comments and this could have ended his career. In addition, in his first meeting with President Franklin Roosevelt, he publicly disagreed with a comment the president made during a meeting. Marshall’s comments were blunt and his response should have ended his career, but it did not. In fact, in both instances Marshall’s career was advanced.

The risk of engaging in this type of forthright discourse with one's superiors is that the comments, whether solicited or not, need to be concise and completely accurate. For each potentially career ending instance in which Marshall spoke frankly with his superiors, he was factually correct and had the moral courage to speak his mind. Marshall also stressed this type of leadership to his subordinate officers. Puryear notes that during World War II Marshall once stated to division commanders that officers should have "the moral courage to report facts, unpleasant as they may be, to the ears of the commander, rather than trying to keep bad news from him."⁵ He expected his officers to speak bluntly with him and once stated to General Bradley, "I'm disappointed with you. You haven't yet disagreed with a single decision I've made." To wit, Bradley smartly replied, "When we differ with you on a decision, sir, we'll tell you so."⁶ This dialogue clearly demonstrates that Marshall expected those that worked for him to engage with him the same way that he engaged with his superiors. It also demonstrates that his subordinates knew this and were ready to act accordingly when appropriate.

This type of leadership style is anathema to most military leaders today. Leaders today believe that they should lead from a position of strength, dole out orders without a consensus, so-to-speak, and counsel those that do not perform or feel the need to debate with their bosses. It is usually true that commanders are chosen for command positions because they have demonstrated leadership abilities that make them the best candidates to lead others. In fact, many contemporary officers use the slang expression, "shut up and color," to express their experiences with leaders who are unwilling to listen to subordinates who speak frankly when it comes to decisions they have made or orders they have issued. Clearly Marshall would have opposed what the army has evolved to

today regarding the roles subordinates play in decision making.

Aside from his views on challenging subordinates, seeing things in clear and definitive terms, and speaking bluntly, he also provided many direct comments about his views on leadership in the army. Marshall truly believed that leadership was a facet of officers that was the decisive factor on the battlefield. In fact, on April 9, 1940, shortly after Adolph Hitler had advanced into the Denmark and Norway, Marshall testified before the House of Representatives, Committee on Military Affairs and he discussed his beliefs about military leadership. He stated that “Leadership in the field depends...on one’s ability to withstand hardships, and lack of sleep, and still be disposed energetically and aggressively to command men, to dominate men on the battlefield.”⁷ When later pressed by the chairman of this committee, Andrew J. May of Kentucky, to prioritize the most important thing to invest several billion dollars of National Defense, Marshall responded, “Leadership is the most important consideration, if any one thing is more important than another.”⁸ He viewed this as vital for American soldiers because it was a defining characteristic of American officers. In garrison, on the battlefield, at home, or in local communities, Marshall believed that officers must demonstrate their leadership abilities. He told officers that they could never forget that they were officers. In a speech he gave to the first graduating class of the Officer Candidates School (OCS) at Fort Benning, Georgia, he stated,

Never for an instant can you divest yourselves of the fact that you are officers. On the athletic field, at the club, in civilian clothes, or even at home on leave, the fact that you are a commissioned officer in the Army imposes a constant obligation to higher standards than might ordinarily seem normal or necessary for your personal guidance. A small dereliction becomes conspicuous, at times notorious, purely by reason of the fact that the individual concerned is a commissioned officer.”⁹

As mentioned in the previous chapter, he plainly viewed officers as the key to upholding

the image of the American military as the sentinels of national morality.

Indeed, he mentioned many times that leadership did not just mean courage, something he felt would inherently be accepted when engaged with the enemy. He believed that leaders led by example, were fair and patriotic, religiously and morally focused, and had the quality of steadfast fortitude and discipline to follow through on assigned duties and to complete, as best possible, any given task. Officers who led this way built a reputation that they had strength of character and this enabled men to follow them in battle. Marshall clarified this further when he stated, “The feeling which the men hold for you is not to be compared to the popularity of a football coach or a leader of civic activities. Professional competence is essential to leadership and your knowledge of arms, equipment, and tactical operations must be clearly superior to that possessed by your subordinates; at the same time, you must command their respect above and beyond those qualities.”¹⁰ In addition, he valued intelligence, mental alertness, initiative, vision. He once stated, “The truly great leader overcomes all difficulties, and campaigns and battles are nothing but a long series of difficulties to be overcome...the real leader displays his quality in his triumphs over adversity, however great it may be.”¹¹ Leadership, he believed, is not a facet of seniority, he stated, “Leadership in the field and especially during the hurried organization of the urgently needed new units must not depend on seniority.”¹² He clearly demonstrated this when he promoted Eisenhower from a lieutenant colonel to a brigadier general and bypassed 350 officers senior to Eisenhower.¹³ Throughout his comments, Marshall highlights the aspects of his leadership style, which he believes others should emulate. Certainly his comments emphasize that he believes officers should have a leadership style in which they fulfill

their duties, maintain a disciplined lifestyle that is steeped in religious morality, develop a tireless work ethic, always have a desire to learn, and genuinely have an interest in subordinate mentorship.

Marshall also believed that officers needed to be selfless leaders, and that this was something that must be transparent in their leadership styles. They needed to make fair evaluations of circumstances and render realistic, clear, and selfless decisions. Thus, when confronted with an opportunity for personal gain or recognition, true leaders will not surrender to the temptation for glory, but will instead make a sound decision that is mission focused. This character trait can singularly be summed by Marshall when considering a discussion he had with President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the Cairo Conference in December 1943. When Roosevelt asked who should lead Operation Overlord, Marshall responded that it was not his decision to make. President Roosevelt had earlier thought that Marshall should be the leader of this operation, but he dreaded the thought of losing him as his Army Chief of Staff. In fact, in November 1943, when President Roosevelt visited General Eisenhower in North Africa, he said the following:

You and I know who the Chief of Staff was during the last years of the Civil War but practically no one else knows.... I hate to think that 50 years from now practically nobody will know who George Marshall was. That is one of the reasons why I want George to have the big Command-he is entitled to establish his place in history as a great General.¹⁴

It soon became evident in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere that Roosevelt, Churchill, and others wanted Marshall to lead this historic operation, and it would be unrealistic to think that Marshall had not heard of this through rumors or innuendo. Thus, Marshall likely thought that either orders or a conversation with President Roosevelt about this was likely in the offing. According to Ambrose, when Marshall finally did speak with Roosevelt

about this, he replied, “that while he would gladly serve wherever the President told him to, he would not be the judge in his own case.” Ambrose adds that, “Roosevelt made his decision. As the last meeting at Cairo was breaking up, Roosevelt asked Marshall to write a message to Stalin for him. As Roosevelt dictated, Marshall wrote, ‘From the President to Marshal Stalin, the immediate appointment of General Eisenhower to command Overlord operation has been decided upon.’”¹⁵ Like so many times before in Marshall’s career, he had been passed up for a great opportunity. He had the opportunity of a lifetime to lead the largest amphibious military operation in world history, and rather than simply state that he was up to the task, he ultimately left this important and historic decision in the appropriate and capable hands of the civilian leader and Commander-in-Chief. This selfless act by Marshall should serve as a glaring example for all Soldiers to consider throughout their military careers.

There is likely little doubt that it must have been difficult for Marshall to take dictation for this message, but therein lay the great example of selflessness in Marshall’s leadership. He was not consumed by his career, and he did not sacrifice humility, honor, morals, or who he was simply for personal gain. The country and the army came first, and he knew how to fulfill his duties for both. Marshall’s comments likely confirmed to Roosevelt that Marshall’s frankness, albeit a good leadership trait for the military, was likely not a good quality when trying to work with Allied forces to put together an Allied invasion. Roosevelt obviously needed a competent Marshall type of leader who had some sense of domestic political savoir-faire, albeit blunt and honest, to make this invasion work. That is why he correctly chose General Eisenhower, a leader who was more politically-minded and effective at coalition building. Ambrose notes that

“Eisenhower had proved that he could create and run an integrated staff and successfully command combined British-American operations. No other general had done so.”¹⁶

Marshall had never had an opportunity to command an Allied operation, and a masterful politician like Roosevelt ultimately took a Clausewitz perspective and made a politically focused decision rather than simply a personal one.

Eisenhower’s Military Leadership Style

Like Marshall, Eisenhower was also demanding of his staff, and he therefore carefully scrutinized officers to serve on his staff. Puryear notes that Eisenhower would say to his staff, “You are handpicked experts in your field. I expect you to get your jobs done without supervision. Otherwise, I made a mistake in selection.”¹⁷ He expected much from his staff and therefore felt comfortable delegating authority to them. This is not to say that Eisenhower was an absented commander, he was not. He had no problem letting those who worked for him know that he was the boss; he just did not micromanage their efforts. Like Marshall, he was also not afraid to speak frankly with his superiors and many times did this while working for both Marshall and MacArthur. In fact, Mark Perry mentions that in one instance, Marshall effectively told Eisenhower that he was not going to get promoted, and that he was going to continue working for him and never move. This was the same type of comment Ike had received from MacArthur, and he consequently handled his response in the same way that he did with MacArthur.

Eisenhower made the following reply to Marshall, “General, I don’t give a damn about your promotion. I was brought in here to do my duty. I am doing that duty to the best of my ability and I am just trying to do my part in winning the war.”¹⁸ He would likewise expect subordinate officers who worked for him to speak bluntly with him. Puryear notes

that he was a leader “who would listen to all points of view with the ability to analyze a problem, extract its core, and work out a solution.”¹⁹ In addition to his views on subordinate officers and his concern that they speak frankly with him as he had done with Marshall and MacArthur, he also provided many direct comments about his views on leadership in the army.

After his experience as the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, during World War II, Eisenhower stated that, in his opinion, “Leadership cannot be exercised by the weak. It demands strength.”²⁰ Clearly, he valued strength of character as a vital leadership skill that leaders must demonstrate as part of their leadership styles. Some years later, *The Reader’s Digest Association* asked Eisenhower to write an article elaborating in more detail about what he considered vital military leadership traits. He listed the following leadership characteristics he considered essential: selfless service, fortitude of spirit, courage and conviction, humility, and the ability to persuade others.

Referring to selfless service, he stated, “Perhaps the greatest of these qualities is single-minded and selfless dedication to the task at hand. Any leader worth his salt must of course possess a certain amount of ego, a justifiable pride in his own accomplishments. But if he is a truly great leader, the cause must predominate over self.”²¹ This characteristic was paramount for a soldier to fulfill his duty, another concept Eisenhower held most strongly. In fact, in this article he referenced General George C. Marshall as the greatest example of a soldier who served selflessly.

Eisenhower explained what he meant by fortitude of spirit and courage and conviction by presenting examples from American military history. The two most important American historical figures that impacted his understanding of military

leadership were George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. In his opinion, George Washington was a great leader who set the standard for fortitude of spirit. Ike believed that Washington established the precedent for military leaders “to stand strong under reverses, to rise from defeat in order to do battle again, [and] to learn from one’s mistakes [in order to] push on to the ultimate goal.”²² During World War II, he applied his understanding of fortitude of spirit when he stated, “We have reached the point where troops must secure objectives assigned...we must direct leaders to get out and lead and to secure the necessary results.”²³ In Eisenhower’s opinion, Washington “was an almost sublime embodiment of the finest qualities of leadership: dedication, stamina, courage, honesty, intelligence, fairness, patience, capacity to plan, consideration for others, pride leavened with humility and, perhaps most important of all, the ability to inspire other men.”²⁴

In addition, he regarded Lincoln as a leader who had insurmountable courage and conviction during the Civil War, something he considered vital for leaders, especially during difficult times. He believed that good leaders needed courage to prevent deviations from established objectives. Considering the difficulties that leaders encountered during the amphibious landings at Normandy, France on June 6th, 1944, Ike understood how courageous leaders must be in order to secure seemingly impossible objectives. Eisenhower biographer Robert J. Donovan adds another perspective to Eisenhower’s views of President Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War. He stated what impressed Eisenhower was that “Lincoln’s drive toward his goal was seemingly so great that he never allowed himself to be deflected by such things as slights by subordinates.”²⁵ Ike’s adherence to this idea was evident during World War II when he had to manage

infractions from flamboyant subordinates like Generals George S. Patton and Bernard L. Montgomery and at the same time advance Allied interests in Europe.

Another leadership quality Ike considered important was humility. Ike's understanding of humility can be traced to the following phrase his mentor, Major General Fox Conner, used to tell him: "Always take your job seriously, never yourself."²⁶ Ike did not like subordinate soldiers, either officer or enlisted, who bragged about their accomplishments or who were too concerned about advancing themselves. He stated,

Most advice [from staff officers] is, of course, colored by individuals who subconsciously think of their own power or opportunities for advancement. I get exceedingly weary of the little people that spend their time worrying about promotion, personal prestige, prerogatives, and so on, rather than forgetting everything in the desire to get on with the work.²⁷

Instead, Ike believed the deeds of a good leader would speak volumes about their abilities and, as stated earlier, his motto was "suaviter in modo, fortiter in re," which means "gently in manner, strong in deed."²⁸ Eisenhower had experience working with humble officers such as Generals Conner, Bradley, and Marshall, and he had equally disappointing experiences working with egotistical officers such as generals MacArthur, Patton, and Montgomery. In his opinion, officers who neither expected praise nor deflected blame displayed humility. He stated,

A sense of humility is a quality I have observed in every leader whom I have deeply admired.... My own conviction is that every leader should have enough humility to accept, publicly, the responsibility for the mistakes of the subordinates he has himself selected and, likewise, to give them credit, publicly, for their triumphs.²⁹

In a letter to his son John, Ike made the following comment regarding humility: "Always try to make your whole platoon look upon you as the 'old man.' If the platoon or any member of it has done anything badly, try to keep any senior from jumping directly onto

your men. Let them jump on you and don't present any alibi because if the man failed it was probably due to your lack of prior instruction and foresight.... [Leaders] take all the blame on [their]...shoulders and give the credit to the sergeants and the corporals."³⁰

Finally, Eisenhower believed that a successful leader had to have the ability to persuade others. He stated, "The...commander must...be calm, clear, and determined – and in all commands...his success will be measured more by his ability to lead and persuade than by his adherence to fixed notions of arbitrary command practices."³¹

Eisenhower had an interesting approach to persuade subordinates to dutifully and loyally follow his plans. He did not lead by committee, and at the same time he was not a dictatorial leader; instead, Ike helped soldiers, both officers and enlisted, feel that they were an integral part of his planning. Part of his approach to persuade subordinates was to interact with them and ask for their input regarding past, present, and future military operations. He sincerely listened to them and accorded them respect for their opinions, even though he may or may not have altered his ideas to accommodate what they had told him. He believed that there were times when leaders must make decisions regardless of what others may think, but he stated "whenever men can be persuaded rather than ordered - when they can be made to feel that they have participated in developing the plan - they approach their tasks with understanding and enthusiasm."³² Considering the various different personalities and leadership ideas Eisenhower had to cope with as the Supreme Allied Commander, his approach to persuading subordinates seemed logical and probably helped hold the Allied coalition together.

In addition to the five important leadership skills Eisenhower detailed in his *Reader's Digest* article, he considered the following to be important military leadership

traits: a tireless work ethic, enthusiasm for one's job, respect for superiors, leadership objectives that are philosophically focused, emotional restraint, and a constant concern for training. These elements of his leadership style were as important as the others previously mentioned. For Eisenhower, a good officer exhibited all of these leadership traits.

Regardless of his rank or position, Ike always maintained an aggressive and tireless work ethic, a trait he learned well from his upbringing in Abilene. He took his job seriously and was not interested in cutting corners or dodging his duty. According to Ambrose, "He went to bed late, got up early, worked seven days a week, and had to be forced to relax. For four years he averaged five hours' sleep a night."³³ Also as part of his work ethic, he believed it was very important for leaders to publicly display a sense of optimism and confidence. He believed that, "Without confidence, enthusiasm, and optimism in the command, victory is scarcely obtainable."³⁴ He handled himself this way because he thought it was important to never show doubt in public. He stated that, "I did my best to meet everyone from general to private with a smile, a pat on the back and a definite interest in his problems."³⁵ This sense of optimism, confidence, and interest in soldier concerns set the standard for his subordinates and was vital for morale in World War II. From Eisenhower's perspective, a leader must inspire confidence and support, no matter how he feels or how difficult the situation.

Eisenhower also believed that a confident, enthusiastic, and optimistic attitude should apply when subordinate leaders receive new job assignments. He believed that soldiers should never complain about a job or an assignment that was given to them. With regard to new job assignments, Ike just accepted that he was going "to perform

every duty given me...to the best of my ability...no matter what [its]...nature.”³⁶ He felt soldiers should trust the officers appointed over them and aggressively pursue any job they were assigned. Ike believed that soldiers needed to accept that their superiors are well aware of how miserable a job may be, but that they were picked because their superior considered them to be the best soldier to get the job done. He conveyed this idea in another letter he wrote to John. Eisenhower stated, “Seniors like to have subordinates that react enthusiastically upon being detailed to an additional and often onerous duty.”³⁷ In addition, Ike also believed that for those officers who receive job assignments to important posts, “loyalty and efficiency [are] not enough - discretion, reliability, and sobriety [are] mandatory.”³⁸ These were skills he observed in Conner, Marshall, Smith, and Bradley and they were skills that Patton, MacArthur, and Montgomery lacked.

In addition to aggressively accepting a new job assignment, Ike expected subordinate leaders to be respectful, competent, enthusiastic, optimistic, and not “too free with advice.” He thought that good leaders sometimes needed to be good followers. He rarely crossed the line with his boss, and he conveyed this idea to his son in a letter. Ike stated, “Within your own sphere -- that is, your own platoon...- apply every bit of knowledge that you have but do not make the mistake of telling the captain how he should run his job. When he asks for information or advice, give it in a respectful, pleasant manner and don’t be afraid of showing your enthusiasm for any task he gives you.”³⁹

Eisenhower also thought that subordinate leaders should have a solid philosophical understanding of their role in the military and the purpose of their mission. He stated, “[T]here must be a deep-seated conviction in every individual’s mind that he is

fighting for a cause worthy of any sacrifice he may make.”⁴⁰ Ike believed it was important for American Soldiers to know why they were taking up arms for their country and he expected leaders to clearly explain that to their troops. He thought it was necessary for Soldiers to have a simple understanding of the welfare of their nation and their individual relationship to the protection of that welfare. Eisenhower also believed this was an important element for successfully conducting war. However, he cautioned that, “No matter how earnestly commanders may attempt to influence a [S]oldier’s habits, his training, his conduct, or extoll [sic] the virtues of gallantry and fortitude, they shyly stop short of going into matters which they fear may be interpreted as ‘preaching.’”⁴¹ Essentially, Ike understood it was part of a leader’s job to convey a basic national political philosophy but not to carry that into a personal philosophical tirade, political or otherwise.

In addition, he believed it was important for military leaders to monitor their feelings and emotions publicly, even though that is not always easy to do. Eisenhower considered controlling his anger in public as a duty to effective leadership, especially when handling discipline proceedings with subordinates. He stated, “I learned a long time ago that...anybody that aspired to a position of leadership of any kind...must learn to control his temper.”⁴² However, it would be a mistake to say that Eisenhower never got angry at subordinates, because he sometimes did. Nevertheless, his rare expressions of anger were conducted privately between him and the offending soldier. According to Greenstein, Eisenhower believed that successful leaders knew how to control their tempers. He stated, “One reason why [Eisenhower] controlled his temper so successfully was that he had an even more powerful conviction that leaders are charged with

responsibilities and must suppress personal impulse if duty so dictated.” Further, he stated, “Eisenhower’s capacity for controlling outward manifestations of his feelings also undoubtedly stemmed from his conviction that a leader’s duty is to keep his impulses in check and act rationally.” Continuing, Greenstein also pointed out, “He worked at his apparent artlessness, consciously choosing strategies that made people want to support him. And on occasion the sunny personality masked anger or despondency, since he viewed it as a duty of the responsible leader to exude optimism.”⁴³

In addition to keeping one’s emotions in check, Ike believed good leaders were constantly focused on training their troops for eventual combat. In still another letter to John he stated,

[E]very chance must be seized for training day in and day out and in all kinds of weather. The worse the weather the more necessary it is to train. This gives you a fine chance to toughen up your men, usually ending up the march back to camp with some double-time to get warmed up. It also gives you a chance to go around and see every man, to see that he gets into warm, dry clothing, that the stuff he has taken off is immediately arranged so as to be fit to wear the next day; that he gets a good hot meal and that his weapons are in tiptop shape.... By pursuing these methods you will not only have a splendidly trained platoon, but one that will follow you anywhere.⁴⁴

In an earlier letter to John, Eisenhower outlined essential elements of a good training program that would be designed to ready troops for combat. Some of the elements he pointed out included the following:

[E]very single one of your men should be trained in mine removal and all should be as proficient in the use of basic weapons as you can possibly make them. In action or maneuvers never forget the importance of reconnaissance [to the front, flanks, and rear] in order that you may know exactly and at all times where you can send a message in a hurry and always be prepared to fight in these areas. Make your platoon runners become as tough and as hardy and as good trail finder[s] as the American Indian was.”

In that same letter he mentioned how important it was for leaders to be physically as

tough as the subordinates they command. He stated, “Your physical toughness and endurance you must watch every day.”⁴⁵ In another reference to maintaining physical readiness, Eisenhower noted that a good leader “must be indifferent to fatigue and ruthless in demanding the last atom of physical energy.”⁴⁶

Eisenhower also believed that leaders must be competent in their branch of service. In a previously mentioned letter to John he stated, “Don’t be afraid to do the dirty work yourself of improving your own expertness with every weapon with which you have anything to do.... It is equally important that you become, if possible, more expert in the use of every single weapon than any one of your men is in any one of them.”⁴⁷ Simply stated, Ike believed that leaders should be willing to work as much as, if not more than the subordinates they command. With respect to incompetent leaders or leaders who got by on their personality, Eisenhower stated that one day, “[they] will find themselves looking for a job.”⁴⁸

Both Marshall and Eisenhower had clear views regarding how they led. It is also evident that they honed their leadership styles through practical experience and from guidance they were given by senior officers who recognized their abilities. As a result, both officers frequently provided guidance and mentoring to their subordinates so that they could help them develop a keener, refined, and clearer leadership style.

Developing Leadership Abilities through Officer Mentorship

Marshall and Eisenhower both understood the benefits of mentorship because both men profited from it. As result, both men believed in mentoring promising subordinate officers. Uldrich notes that “George Marshall was, above all else, a teacher. He understood that it was his job to not only train his regiment but to share his experience

and knowledge as well.”⁴⁹ As described to some detail in the previous section, Eisenhower was also a teacher and mentor to subordinates who showed promise. Like those that mentored them, both were demanding but once an officer demonstrated a sound sense of military leadership they helped guide and mentor that officer throughout his career.

One person was uniquely connected to the pasts of both men and that was Fox Conner. A largely unstudied American military leader, he mentored both men. Both Marshall and Eisenhower admired him, and both admitted that he played a significant role in their army careers. Conner was a gifted artillery and cavalry officer. During World War I, he demonstrated his ability to plan operations and with sufficient political savoir faire to keep Allies engaged enough to carry out his plans. Pogue describes him as “a towering, imperturbable, concise, Mississippi-born West Pointer who was fluent in French, had served with a French artillery regiment in 1911, and as a liaison officer with the French mission to the United States.”⁵⁰ Soon after he arrived in theater, Pershing immediately recognized Conner’s leadership abilities. As a result, according to Jerome H. Parker, within six months, “Conner was named the Chief of Operations of the American Expeditionary Force (AEF).”⁵¹ One of the staff officers that worked for Conner was then Captain George C. Marshall. Conner was extremely impressed with Marshall’s leadership and planning abilities. According to Edgar F. Puryear, Conner “considered Marshall a genius.” Ambrose adds to this description and points out that Conner insisted that Marshall “knows more about the techniques of arranging allied commands than any man I know. He is nothing short of a genius.”⁵² This was obviously quite an accolade for a colonel who was Chief of Operations to make regarding a captain

who worked on his staff. In the same manner that Pershing mentored and guided Conner's career, so too did Conner mentor and guide Marshall's career. In fact, while working in this capacity, he so impressed Conner and Pershing that he received the brevet rank of full colonel after only having been in his position for little over a month. At the same time, Conner was promoted to brigadier general for demonstrating the same caliber of performance. From this point forward, Conner aided Marshall through his career and was responsible for Marshall meeting and eventually working with Eisenhower.

Following the end of World War I, Conner was given command of the 20th Infantry Brigade, which was then located at the Panama Canal. Soon after receiving this news, he began asking around for a capable officer to be his Executive Officer (XO). One person he asked was then Colonel George S. Patton. Patton recommended Eisenhower, who was then a major, for the position and even arranged for the two of them to meet. Conner was impressed with Eisenhower and asked him if he was interested in the position, to which Eisenhower eagerly accepted. Getting Ike assigned as Conner's XO, however, was not an easy task. The reason for this was that Eisenhower was admonished in 1924 by Chief of the Infantry, Major General Charles S. Farnsworth, for writing a forward thinking article about the benefits of incorporating tanks into infantry tactics and plans. Farnsworth reprimanded for his commentary and told him that future opinionated articles such as this could lead to a court martial and an effective end to his career. Conner recognized what Farnsworth was doing, and he was able to re-direct his request for Eisenhower's assignment by circumventing the system. Instead of going through proper personnel request channels, Conner asked for assistance from Colonel George C. Marshall, who was then serving as an aide-de-camp to the Army

Chief of Staff, General Pershing. Marshall quickly got the request approved and had Eisenhower assigned to Conner in Panama.

Conner and Eisenhower immediately worked well together and became very close friends and even lived next door to one another in Panama. Ambrose notes that “Eisenhower and General Conner...developed a teacher-student relationship.” He mentored Ike, forced him to write numerous field orders and read numerous military history books. In fact, following Ike’s reading assignments Conner would meet with him and ask him probing hypothetical questions such as what would have happened in a particular battle or campaign if some of the factors had been handled differently. Eisenhower thoroughly enjoyed his time working with Conner and according to Ambrose, “Eisenhower almost worshipped Conner.”⁵³ He also added that Eisenhower later in life stated, “In a lifetime of association with great and good men, he is the one figure to whom I owe an incalculable debt.” Not surprisingly, Conner’s evaluation of Eisenhower states that Ike was “one of the most capable, efficient, and loyal officers I have ever met.”⁵⁴ Puryear supports this and notes that, “More than any individual other than himself, the person responsible for [Eisenhower’s] achievement was a tough, dedicated, and brilliant soldier by the name of Fox Conner.”⁵⁵ He was also singularly responsible for Eisenhower reaching opportunities that later catapulted him to widespread recognition. For example, he helped Eisenhower get into the Command and Staff School at Fort Leavenworth. Disappointed that he could not stop Eisenhower’s assignment with Conner, General Farnsworth attempted to block Eisenhower’s attendance at this school. Conner again supported Eisenhower and was able to engineer his attendance at this school; a school which undeniably elevated his abilities and his career.

One of the officers that Conner frequently spoke to Eisenhower about was Marshall. He let Ike know of Marshall's demonstrated leadership abilities during World War I. In fact, as Puryear illustrates, Eisenhower commented on Conner's guidance to him about Marshall and stated in an interview, "I was predisposed towards Marshall because I heard all my life from Fox Conner that Marshall was the ideal [S]oldier."⁵⁶ Eisenhower learned to revere and respect Marshall and his ability to lead. Conner convinced Ike that Marshall was a genius and the future of the army. As a result, he wanted Ike to emulate Marshall's leadership style, and this guidance undoubtedly had an impact on the leadership style that Eisenhower developed. In addition to General Conner, there were others who played key roles in their futures.

For Marshall, that ended up being Generals J. Franklin Bell and John J. Pershing. Marshall first encountered Bell in 1907. He had done well at the conclusion of his first year at the Army Infantry and Cavalry School and Staff College (later known as the Command and General Staff College) at Fort Leavenworth. The Army Chief of Staff, Major General J. Franklin Bell, was a former commandant of the school and was interested in the education of army officers. He was regularly provided with a list of those who had done well at this school and Marshall was on this list. After reviewing a list of top performers, he assigned Marshall and four other officers the task of updating National Guard training so that it conformed to revisions specified in the Dick Act of 1903.⁵⁷ Marshall and the others accomplished the task well. Because of this, Bell realized what Marshall could contribute and later approved for Marshall to serve as an instructor at the school, despite being junior in rank to the officers he was teaching.

The two of them met again in the Philippines in 1914 when Bell was assigned as a

commander of Pacific forces in the Philippines. Marshall, then a first lieutenant, was stationed in the Philippines and assigned as an aide-de-camp to Major General Hunter Liggett in 1913. Shortly after he arrived, however, General Liggett transitioned out and Bell took over. Early into his new assignment Bell conducted a training maneuver exercise, and again he observed Marshall's ability to plan and lead operations. In fact, regarding Marshall's performance during the exercise, Bell stated that Marshall was "the greatest potential wartime leader in the Army."⁵⁸ Bell made this assessment because he knew that Marshall was competent, hard working, meticulous, selfless serving, honorable, and had a sense of humility. He further noticed that when given a task Marshall did not complain or ask for additional things, but instead took what he was given and gave his best effort to accomplish the mission he was assigned. He also knew first hand what Marshall was capable of accomplishing. As a result, Bell ensured that Marshall continued to be assigned as his aide-de-camp, and he kept him with him the entire time he was in the Philippines and later when he was re-assigned as the commander of the Western Department of the Army. It was from this follow-on assignment with Bell that he was detailed to support Brigadier General William L. Sibert with volunteer units in California. This encounter later led to Sibert hand selecting Marshall in 1917 to serve as a member of his division staff when the First Division was deployed as an element of the AEF under Pershing.⁵⁹ Further, it was this connection that brought the Marshall into contact with Pershing, and this first encounter, most would agree, could have gone better.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the first meeting between Pershing and Marshall, then a captain, could have ended Marshall's career but luckily it did not. In

1917, General Pershing inspected General Sibert's Soldiers and following the inspection he chastised Sibert and his recently arrived Chief of Staff in front of everyone for a sloppy and unprepared unit, and said that he was going to hold them personally responsible. Marshall had been the de facto Chief of Staff just prior to the new Chief of Staff reporting and thus he was responsible for preparing the unit for this inspection. He was outraged at Pershing's unjust evaluation and walked up to General Pershing, grabbed his arm, and bluntly expressed his disagreement with the general's comments. By all accounts, he spoke energetically, concisely, and frankly to the general, and he essentially told him that he thought his evaluation was unfair.⁶⁰ Instead of ending Marshall's career, however, General Pershing partially agreed with Marshall's comments, redacted part of his evaluation, and admired him for speaking candidly with him. In fact, he later visited the unit, pulled Marshall aside and asked him for blunt appraisals regarding how the unit was doing. There is no doubt that because of this type of rapport, he later pulled Marshall from his unit and assigned him to Conner's operations staff with the AEF in France during World War I. Pershing's mentorship helped shape and define Marshall's career, and in this way Marshall mentored and shaped Eisenhower's career as well as other subordinates that showed promise.

According to Pershing biographer Richard O'Connor, Pershing later gave Conner and Marshall, two officers he respected and trusted, an assignment to plan the Cantigny Operation. Marshall's contributions and meticulous planning for this operation won him and Conner praise from many including French leader Marshal Foch who originally thought this type of operation was not feasible. O'Connor notes that "General Pershing considered it a 'stupendous task and a delicate one' to engineer." He gave Conner and

his staff the credit and according to O'Connor, "From then on, almost to the day of his death, Pershing was the prime mover, patron, and protector of the modest and quiet-mannered Marshall's career."⁶¹ In fact, following the war, Uldrich notes that Pershing stated that Marshall was "the finest officer that the war produced."⁶² After the war, Pershing also made Marshall his aide-de-camp and gave him assignments and opportunities that helped further cultivate his leadership abilities and his talents as a staff officer. It also should be noted that their friendship was so strong after the war that Pershing agreed to be Marshall's best man when Marshall married his second wife, Katherine Tupper Brown, on October 16, 1930. This strong friendship had merit and significance later in Marshall's army career.

When he had been passed over many times for promotion to brigadier general, Marshall went to Pershing for help. According to Pogue, Marshall wrote Pershing and made the following blunt comments, "Two or three vacancies now exist. I want one of them as I will soon be fifty-four. I must get started if I am going to get anywhere in this Army."⁶³ He followed that by asking Pershing to speak with Secretary of War George Dern and President Franklin Roosevelt to effect his promotion. This type of request by a subordinate officer to his former boss and mentor is unbelievable and breathtaking to say the least. Pogue notes that even though Marshall's efficiency reports were outstanding, "There was irony in the fact that he had now to use influence to bring his recognized merits to the attention of an authority that could act on them."⁶⁴ The temerity of Marshall to dictate his promotion considerations to his former boss, mentor, and friend, who at the time was in a position of influence, was gutsy, seemingly uncharacteristic, and arrogant. He clearly had a sense of entitlement, and he wanted a promotion and was not afraid to

aggressively engage his superiors and pull strings to get what he wanted. In fact, Pogue notes that Marshall actually told Pershing, “I think I am entitled to some consideration now.”⁶⁵ Despite this brazen request, Pershing complied and actually met with both Dern and Roosevelt and requested Marshall’s promotion. This was to no avail, however, because the Army Chief of Staff, General Douglas MacArthur, stopped Marshall’s promotion, and instead wanted him to be the Chief of Infantry, a billet that was slated to possibly be open in a few years. This was noticeably ambiguous and Marshall knew it. This behavior by Marshall is seemingly out of character for him and definitely does not highlight a leader who partially bases his leadership style on self-less service. Still, Marshall felt as though he was being unfairly treated and rather than go quietly into the night, he called in a favor from Pershing, his mentor, friend, and one of the few people who had leverage over MacArthur.

General MacArthur was trying to cut short Marshall’s career and Marshall knew it. The reason for this involves an order that Marshall sent to MacArthur during World War I. The order in question was dictated by Marshall’s boss, General Conner, on behalf of General Pershing, and it called for MacArthur’s unit as well as other units in the First Division to counter-attack across the Meuse River toward the city of Sedan without concern for tactical boundaries. According to Stanley Weintraub, the result of this order “was a free-for-all toward Sedan.” He further added that MacArthur blamed Marshall for the supposed problems MacArthur experienced trying to comply with this order. He also cited MacArthur as stating that Marshall “narrowly missed causing one of the great tragedies of American history.”⁶⁶ MacArthur was hesitant with his response to these orders, and delayed his unit’s advance because he did not want them to operate at night in

unfamiliar territory. He also stopped three miles short of Sedan, and likely out of fear due to intense enemy fire, waited with his unit in an overwatch position, which enabled his unit to monitor movements in the city. As a result, he never actually entered the city. Weintraub points out that MacArthur believed that, “The order that had sent units through each other’s lines was a desk-drafted blunder seemingly committed by one George C. Marshall, a colonel he knew only vaguely [from Fort Leavenworth].”⁶⁷ MacArthur’s lack of respect of Marshall and his disagreement over the order Marshall published, which was really Conner’s order, is likely the reason that MacArthur tried to keep Marshall from getting his promotion to brigadier general. Because he was a promotion group behind Marshall, MacArthur should not have been able to do this. However, through his own self-promotion and politicking he was bumped a few promotion lists ahead of Marshall and thus got into a position of power over him.

Even though Marshall knew who was stopping his promotion, he nonetheless worked around him and leveraged both military and political pressure. Pogue notes that, for a second time, Pershing again asked Roosevelt and Dern to promote Marshall and even went so far as to engage John Callan O’Laughlin, a friend who was a “onetime Assistant Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt,...an official of the Republican National Committee, and publisher of the influential Army and Navy Journal.”⁶⁸ For some undetermined reason, following O’Laughlin’s involvement, Marshall was put on the next list for promotion to brigadier general. The tension between MacArthur and Marshall apparently seemed to be one-sided. MacArthur did not trust Marshall’s competence and abilities as a leader and therefore tried to keep him from influencing the army further.

Surprisingly, Marshall did not openly seem to resent MacArthur, although almost any other officer would have easily resented him. In fact, following MacArthur's evacuation from the Philippines during World War II, Marshall personally drafted and engineered the approval of MacArthur's Medal of Honor award, although he did not present to him in person. Weintraub notes that Marshall did this solely because he "saw a Medal of Honor to a military icon as a boost to domestic morale at a dark time, and an antidote in advance to predictable Axis charges that MacArthur had deserted his men under fire." He also points out Eisenhower knew that Marshall was crafting the award and "argued against the award, contending that MacArthur had been personally reckless on numerous occasions in France in hopes of the decoration."⁶⁹ Nonetheless, after drafting the citation he had Secretary of War Henry Stimson review it, and following Secretary Stimson's comments, he took it President Roosevelt for signature. Marshall's expeditious work to ensure that MacArthur received the highest military honor possible can be viewed a few ways and thus raises a few questions. For example, did he do this because he truly believed that MacArthur deserved this great honor? Did he do this because he saw the image of the American Army at risk after MacArthur's forces surrendered and therefore wanted to bolster a weakened image? Maybe he did this in a brilliant move to give MacArthur the award he always wanted but for an action not worthy of the award. If Marshall did this for this reason, then MacArthur would spend the rest of his life remembering his famous retreat and trying to justify the award. If this assumption is true, then Marshall's efforts demonstrate a cold, methodical, and brilliant insult to MacArthur. According to Weintraub, the latter seems to be true because MacArthur said of the award that he was sure "this award was intended not so much for

me personally as a recognition of the indomitable courage of the gallant army which it was my honor to command.”⁷⁰ Essentially, he answered back that the award was for his men and not himself, and that he accepted on their behalf because he was their commander. Nonetheless, Marshall’s efforts to gain his promotion to general by calling in favors from his mentor and other friends demonstrate the importance of mentors and networking in the army. It also, sadly, demonstrates that cronyism is a facet of army life.

The importance of having and being a mentor is obviously an important part of developing leaders in the army. The clichéd expression, “No man is an island,” is never truer than when considering the refinement of army officers and their leadership skills. Indeed, personal initiative, hard work, and even real talent in military leadership sometimes are not enough to advance one’s career in the military. To be sure, these leadership qualities help, but the demonstration of these skills gets successful leaders noticed by mentors or those in power who can help advance their career. Thus, successful leaders have to understand the need for mentoring and the need to be mentored. It is important to seek guidance and mentorship from senior officers that are successful and have a sincere desire to impart their experience and wisdom to young officers trying to learn the ways of army leadership. Neither Marshall nor Eisenhower would have succeeded without this type of support. Puryear notes, that “The ability to lead is not enough; there must be an opportunity to demonstrate that ability and an influential superior to observe it.”⁷¹ Clearly, both Marshall and Eisenhower were capable men and good leaders, but both needed an influential senior leader to give them an opportunity to demonstrate their skills. For both, Fox Conner played an initial crucial role in the development of their leadership styles as well as the advancement of their

careers. In addition, Marshall benefited from an opportunity to work with outstanding leaders such as Bell and Pershing. Likewise, Eisenhower proved his abilities to Marshall who guided his career along much as Pershing had done for him.

Marshall understood the importance of having a mentor help his career. During his early research on Marshall, Pogue concluded (but could not later prove) that Marshall kept a little black book with the names of talented officers with leadership abilities that he thought needed to be cultivated. This was based on a story involving General James Van Fleet's initial pass over for promotion. Although Pogue never actually saw this book, he believed the story and that Marshall kept this book because he hoped that he could help shape the army with officers he felt could make the greatest impact. By virtue of Marshall's support for their careers, Pogue deduced that the following prominent officers were likely in this book: Omar Bradley, Mark Clark, Joseph Collins, Leonard Gerow, George Patton, Walter Bedell Smith, Maxwell Taylor, Joseph Stilwell, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.⁷² All of these officers had significant roles during World War II, and there is little doubt that, like Pershing did for him, Marshall did for those officers he thought would benefit the country and the army. Using Eisenhower as one example to highlight this, Puryear notes that Eisenhower was assigned to the War Plans Division in 1941. On December 14, 1941, one week after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Marshall ordered Eisenhower to report to his office for a briefing. He had only momentarily met with Eisenhower in passing before this meeting, but he knew of his leadership abilities from Conner. At their meeting, Marshall briefed Ike on the situation in the Pacific and asked for Ike's assessment on how to proceed. Because he wanted to be clear, concise, unassailable, and worthy of the leader to which Conner had described,

Eisenhower asked for a few hours to work out a solution. He quickly worked out a solution which Marshall accepted and approved. Puryear notes that Eisenhower left the meeting thinking that, “His tone implied that I had been given the problem as a check to an answer he had already reached.”⁷³ As previously mentioned, this was the first real conversation the two of them had had, and it was the first real chance that Marshall had to fairly evaluate the leader that Conner had supported so strongly. According to Puryear, “Marshall respected Eisenhower for his honest frankness, intelligence, capacity for work, and most of all for his selflessness.”⁷⁴ Since these are the qualities that he revered for Ike, it is likely that these are the values he revered for all of those he put in his little black book.

Eisenhower, too, had important figures pull strings on his behalf to move his career along. As mentioned earlier, Fox Conner was instrumental in advancing Eisenhower’s career. He mentored him, he helped him get into the right schools, and he helped him get choice assignments. Marshall recognized Eisenhower’s abilities and saw to it that his career progressed, even to command Operation Overlord. Eisenhower was also concerned about bringing along officers he thought could contribute to the army. He helped guide the careers of influential officers such as Omar Bradley, Carl Spaatz, Mark Clark, Lucius Clay, Walter Smith, Joseph Collins, Ray Barker, Lucian Truscott, and Harold Bull.

It is clear that both men achieved their ranks and positions because they were competent and because they were connected to prominent military leaders who oversaw their careers. In addition, both men had a clear understanding of their duties and both were disciplined Soldiers. Further, both were able to impart their leadership styles to

their subordinates.

NOTES

¹ Forrest C. Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942* (New York: Viking Press, 1966.), 15-16.

² Puryear, 81, and Jack Uldrich, *Soldier, Statesman, Peacemaker: Leadership Lessons from George C. Marshall* (New York: AMACOM, 2005), 105.

³ Uldrich, 13.

⁴ Uldrich, 101.

⁵ Puryear, 83.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Marshall, *Selected Speeches*, 44.

⁸ Ibid., 48.

⁹ Ibid., 176.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 177.

¹² Ibid., 81.

¹³ Uldrich, 164.

¹⁴ Puryear, 339.

¹⁵ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 114.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Puryear, 212.

¹⁸ Mark Perry, *Partners in Command: George Marshall and Dwight Eisenhower in War and Peace* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2007), Perry, 58-9.

¹⁹ Puryear, 212.

²⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower (hereafter DDE), *The Quotable Dwight D. Eisenhower*. Compiled and edited by Elsie Gollagher and the staff of *Quote* (Anderson, SC: Droke House, Publishers, Inc., 1967), 125.

²¹ DDE, “What is Leadership?” (Pleasantville, NY: The Reader’s Digest Association, Inc., 1965), 72.

²² *Ibid.*, 77.

²³ Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 185.

²⁴ DDE, “What is Leadership?”, 77.

²⁵ Robert J. Donovan, *Eisenhower: The Inside Story* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1956), 38.

²⁶ Pach and Richardson, 4.

²⁷ IRA, “Eisenhower’s Ideology in World War II,” *Armed Forces & Society* 23 (Summer 97): 599.

²⁸ Greenstein, 57.

²⁹ DDE, “What is Leadership?”, 78.

³⁰ DDE to John Sheldon Doud Eisenhower (hereafter JSDE), 20 September 1943; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).

³¹ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 74.

³² DDE, “What is Leadership?”, 79.

³³ Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander: The War Years of General Dwight D. Eisenhower* (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 320.

³⁴ Greenstein, 37.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

³⁷ DDE to JSDE, 20 September 1943.

³⁸ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 76.

³⁹ DDE to JSDE, 20 September 1943.

⁴⁰ Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 322.

- ⁴¹ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 454.
- ⁴² Greenstein, 44.
- ⁴³ Ibid., 45, 53.
- ⁴⁴ DDE to JSDE, 2 November 1944.
- ⁴⁵ DDE to JSDE, 20 September 1943.
- ⁴⁶ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 181.
- ⁴⁷ DDE to JSDE, 20 September 1943.
- ⁴⁸ DDE, "What is Leadership?", 78.
- ⁴⁹ Uldrich, 142.
- ⁵⁰ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 170.
- ⁵¹ Jerome H. Parker, IV. "Fox Conner and Dwight Eisenhower: Mentoring and Application" (*Military Review*, July-August, 2005), 1.
- ⁵² Ambrose, *Soldier and President*, 40.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ Puryear, 162.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., 80.
- ⁵⁷ The following information was taken from the National Archives Internet Website at the following address: <http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/168.html>. The Militia Division established in the Adjutant General's Office (AGO), 1903, to replace a militia section of the Miscellaneous Division, AGO, which had been established subsequent to the passage of the First Militia (Dick) Act (32 Stat. 775), January 21, 1903, making the state militias and national guards the reserve component of the federal army. By War Department order, February 12, 1908, confirmed by the Second Militia (Dick) Act (35 Stat. 399), May 27, 1908, Division of Militia Affairs, superseding the Militia Division, established in the Office of the Secretary of War. Transferred to the Office of the Chief of Staff, July 25, 1910, and renamed the Militia Bureau by the National Defense (Army Reorganization) Act (39 Stat. 203), June 3, 1916. See 168.4
- ⁵⁸ Puryear, 379.

- ⁵⁹ Stoler, 34-5.
- ⁶⁰ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 152-53.
- ⁶¹ Richard O'Connor. *Black Jack Pershing* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961), 301.
- ⁶² Uldrich, 17.
- ⁶³ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 293-4.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., 294.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Stanley Weintraub. *15 Stars: Eisenhower, MacArthur, Marshall: Three Generals Who Saved the American Century* (New York: Free Press, 2007), 121.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 295-6.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., 57-58.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., 59.
- ⁷¹ Puryear, 169.
- ⁷² Perry, 4.
- ⁷³ Puryear, 164-5.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., 80.

CHAPTER 4

DUTY, DISCIPLINE, POLITICS, AND SUBORDINATES

Leadership Style and Duty

Each person interprets the concept of duty differently depending on how events have shaped his or her life. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines duty as: conduct due to parents and superiors; obligatory tasks, conduct, service, or functions that arise from one's position; and the force of moral obligation.¹ The question becomes, how do Soldiers define duty? Soldiers swear an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States, thus for each Soldier it is their duty to fulfill this obligation.² This of course does not obfuscate a Soldier's moral obligations to fulfill his duties to his family, his faith, and to his direct supervisor. Certainly these other duties have an impact on how Soldiers are able to fulfill their duties to the Constitution and thus the country. How then does each Soldier prioritize the duties that they are morally obligated to fulfill? Much like the Army motto, "Duty, Honor, Country," each Soldier must prioritize the duties he or she must fulfill. For example, patriotic ideologues would consider their duty to the Constitution as their priority, and family and faith would be lower on their list of concerns. For other Soldiers, their duty to their faith takes precedent over their duty to support the Constitution. Because God is specifically stipulated in the oath that commissioned officers affirm, and because the Constitution is law based on Judeo-Christian beliefs, perhaps faith is intended to be a factor, if not the overriding factor, in the military. Considering a position that faith is a more powerful motivator than political ideology, it is feasible that those Soldiers strongly connected to their faith might prioritize their duties as faith, family, and then support and defense of the Constitution.

Regardless of how officers view and prioritize duty in their lives, it is nonetheless an obvious facet of their leadership style. For example, an officer's sense of duty guides how he or she spends their time, it helps motivate them, and it keeps them and those they lead focused on their mission. An officer's clarity of duty inspires and educates those they lead; indeed, it is a guiding factor in how Soldier's view selfless service to their country and to their families. It also pushes Soldiers to develop great work ethics to accomplish a mission. It is therefore imperative that each officer carefully considers their understanding of duty and how it relates to them, their leadership style, and those they lead. How Marshall and Eisenhower viewed their duty as officers is relevant and provides insight into their leadership styles.

Marshall's Views Regarding Duty

Marshall's sense of duty was widely recognized as a principle aspect of his leadership. He gained this reputation by prioritizing duty in the following manner: support and defense of the Constitution first and foremost, then loyalty to his immediate supervisor, and finally support for his family. He undoubtedly was a patriotic ideologue, but his ideology was steeped in his faith. Marshall viewed his moral obligations to fulfill his duties from a religiously righteous perspective. As mentioned earlier, he inculcated an understanding of his religious beliefs into his work, and it is a theme in his policies when he was the Chief of Staff of the Army. Nonetheless, once given an assignment or a task by a superior, he saw the task through to completion, whether he liked it or not. He viewed the fulfillment of his duty as a Soldier as a facet of honor and thus a moral obligation. For Marshall, then, he felt an ideological and spiritual sense of duty as stipulated and otherwise implied in the Constitution, and, as a result, his family took a

lower priority. In essence, he believed that, since he was in uniform, he accepted the fact that he had given his word to fulfill his duty to the Constitution and the country. For him, it was a sense of honor to fulfill that duty and this soon became a stalwart element of his leadership and character. In fact, he believed this so strongly that he often stated that Soldiers always have a duty to support and defend the Constitution.

This strong sense of loyalty to the Constitution is undeniably connected with his understanding of Judeo-Christian beliefs. Going further, he also stated that it is the duty of leaders to always set the example and do the right thing. For Marshall, leaders needed to deeply adhere to a morally righteous lifestyle that always put them above reproach. Thus if a leader lived his life in this manner, leading Soldiers would just be another facet of their lives. In the previously mentioned speech that he gave to the first graduating class of OCS, he made it clear that leaders must live this type of lifestyle all the time, whether in uniform or not. In essence, then, leaders were always required to uphold their duty to the Constitution and to the Army. This duty obligation also extended across all levels of their lives and even into each Soldiers home while they were on leave. Leaders who had an ideological sense of duty to the Constitution and served as examples while in the military was something that Marshall professed and practiced, and it was something he looked for in an officer when considering him for advancement. From this perspective, Marshall closely fits Bogle's civil-military religious sentinel of national morality. His actions conformed to the George Washington American Cincinnatus model of civic and personal virtue.

Marshall also followed the orders of those army superiors appointed over him. By dutifully carrying out his responsibilities to those leaders selected to lead him, he was

also supporting the Constitution. Because he had a strong sense of duty to the Constitution and those appointed over him, he developed the reputation of being an officer who did not vacillate on tasks assigned to him. Marshall led by example in this regard, and he helped define the leadership skills and abilities as well as the character of many officers in the military. This is not to say, however, that Marshall did not provide input regarding an assigned task or mission when he was given one. On the contrary, when asked for his candid opinion about something, and on rare occasions when he was not asked, he provided his superiors with an unvarnished, unapologetic answer. This was clear during a meeting with members of the President's cabinet and other military advisors, which he attended at the White House on November 14, 1938, while he served as the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army. As Puryear notes, during the meeting and in front of everyone present, President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked Marshall whether or not he agreed with his plan to send 10,000 combat aircraft to France and England. Surprised the aircraft were not going to the United States, Marshall stated, "Mr. President,...but I don't agree with you at all."³ This example provides great insight into Marshall's sense of duty to the Constitution. He understood the potential career risk he was taking by publicly disagreeing with the President (and Commander-in-Chief of the military) on a military matter, but he was asked for his opinion and he gave a straightforward response. Essentially, Marshall realized in an instance that his clear and blunt assessment and disagreement with the President's plan was more important to the American people and the Constitution, in his opinion, than it was to protect his career or the President's reputation. Viewed from this perspective, Marshall demonstrated a remarkable sense of personal courage, a clear ideological conviction, demonstrated selflessness, and a sense

of duty to support the Constitution. He hated “yes men” working for him, and the previously mentioned comment that he gave to General Bradley regarding his concern that he had not challenged one of his decisions makes that evident. In addition, his response to President Roosevelt demonstrates that he was not a “yes man,” and he wanted the highest ranking officer in his chain of command to know that.

In addition, it should also be noted that in some rare instances, Marshall provided unsolicited advice regarding a task or mission one of his superiors gave him. The most noteworthy example was the previously mentioned initial encounter he had with General Pershing when Pershing was inspecting troops with whom Marshall had been working. In this instance, Marshall provided his unsolicited opinion, but he viewed the evaluation General Pershing had provided about troops for which he was responsible to train as unfair, and he made the snap decision that the injustice was so unfair that it was worth risking his career to set the record straight with the general. At the least, this unusual response by Marshall demonstrated his ability to take risks, his strength of character, and his strong sense of duty regarding the fulfillment of his duties to the Constitution. This highlights that Marshall believed that Soldiers had a duty to respectfully challenge the decisions of their superiors. This sense of duty, for Marshall, is nested in his understanding that this type of behavior helps better support the Constitution, his first duty priority.

Despite Marshall’s potential grievance with a task or mission, he nonetheless still followed it through to completion and gave his best effort in the process. He might not like a task or mission, and he may state what is wrong with it if given the opportunity, but he still understood he had a duty to comply when his superiors had made up their minds.

Cray notes that Marshall viewed an officer's duty to his job as non-negotiable and something an officer could not abdicate through resignation. For example, he made this clear when he disagreed with President Truman's decision to recognize Israel as a sovereign country. When asked publicly if he would resign due to the president's decision, Cray notes that Marshall stated, "No, gentlemen, you don't take a post of this sort and then resign when the man who has the constitutional responsibility to make decisions makes one you don't like."⁴ Marshall's moral sense of obligation to fulfill his duty to support the Constitution and to support his superiors was clearly a priority in his life.

After he had satisfied this duty, he next prioritized his duty obligations to his family. His moral sense of obligation to fulfill his duty as a husband were second in priority, but like his first duty priority, he saw his responsibilities to his wife Elizabeth "Lily" Carter Coles (and later after Lily died to his second wife Katherine) through to completion, no matter how difficult those duties were. As mentioned previously, Marshall believed he had a duty to act as an officer all day and every day regardless of the circumstances. As a result, he knew that since he had made a commitment to his wife, he was honor bound to fulfill his duties to her, after of course, he had fulfilled his soldierly duties.

In fact, his commitment to Lily began as early as his courtship with her while he was enrolled at VMI. As earlier discussed, Marshall risked expulsion from VMI by leaving campus to court Lily. He was not risk averse and considered the risk acceptable because he was in love with her.⁵ Shortly after graduating VMI, he married her in an Episcopal ceremony. On their wedding night after they had been legally married,

however, she revealed devastating news to him. According to Stanley Weintraub, she told him that due to her heart condition she could never have children or engage in sex.⁶ There can be little doubt that, as a twenty-one year old male and new second lieutenant in the army, this must have been a significant blow to Marshall. Nonetheless, he understood that he had made a spiritual and legal commitment to Lily, and that he had a duty to support her, and he honored it. There is no evidence that he ever betrayed her or committed adultery even though he had ample opportunity to do so. In fact, Cray notes that unlike other soldiers, “Marshall apparently avoided alcohol and whores alike; despite long separations from Lily, there would be no whisper of scandal about the man.”⁷ Instead, he devoted himself to her and frequently doted on her. Cray points out that,

Marshall lavished a hundred little attentions on Lily.... He fetched and carried. He planned little surprises. He was solicitous about her health and comfort. He relieved her of mundane financial budgeting and any like chores and decisions, ...he paid her innumerable little compliments.... He gave her his unremitting consideration, smoothed the path before his queen and led her by his hand.⁸

In fact, Marshall would turn down opportunities to meet with officers and others after hours just so that he could be with his wife. Many times he declined invitations by officers to play poker or to have an after hours drink. Mark Stoler notes that, “Stories abound regarding Marshall’s racing home after the day’s work to be with [Lily] and of their numerous quiet evenings together at home.”⁹ This is not to mean that he left work as soon as possible, for he did not shirk his duty. In fact, Stoler notes that he worked too hard and was early diagnosed with neurasthenia, which is a general medical diagnosis to describe “everything from physical exhaustion to a nervous breakdown.”¹⁰ For Marshall, racing home to be with his wife is only indicative of the special life they shared together. She was a safe and unassuming sounding board, and a personal confidant for him, much

like his mother was to him in his youth. He could freely speak with her as well as unburden his problems and discuss his concerns in life. As a result, Marshall was viewed by his peers as aloof, contemplative, brooding, and sometimes a loner. Ambrose notes that Eisenhower respected Marshall but that he considered him “remote and austere.”¹¹ Still, this type of behavior only reinforces the image of Marshall as a army leader who was a sentinel of national morality.

Eisenhower’s Views Regarding Duty

A military leadership trait that Ike considered important was the fulfillment of one’s duty. Eisenhower’s understanding of duty was partially shaped through his experiences with Marshall. The latter reinforced to Ike how important it was for Soldiers to selflessly fulfill their duty obligations to support the Constitution. Indeed, according to Puryear, Eisenhower believed that he would have ended his army career doing routine operations work, if he had not had conversations with Marshall about duty and selflessness.¹² Once given an assignment or a task by a superior, Ike like Marshall, saw the task through to completion, whether he liked it or not. This was never more true than when he worked with General Douglas MacArthur in the Philippines. Puryear notes that Eisenhower’s “diary from his tour in the Philippines under General MacArthur reveals that the experience was not pleasant. Ike and MacArthur were certainly not close; there was no real camaraderie between them.”¹³ Eisenhower performed his duties to the best of his abilities, and as a result he became an invaluable staff asset that MacArthur did not want to lose. When Ike was asked by MacArthur for his opinions, like Marshall, Ike gave candid assessments. According to Mark Perry, Ike cynically referred to himself as MacArthur’s “good man Friday” in an effort to describe all the essential and non-

essential tasks he was given. He also referred to MacArthur as “General Impossible” because MacArthur was moody, egotistical, and petty.¹⁴ Perry also highlights that Eisenhower would even get into yelling matches with MacArthur when he expressed disagreement on tasks or missions. In one instance he challenged MacArthur’s decision to accept a field marshal position from the Philippines. This led to a yelling match and devolved into Eisenhower saying the following, “Why in the hell don’t you fire me?...you do things I don’t agree with and you know damn well I don’t.”¹⁵ Despite his confrontations and disagreements with MacArthur, Eisenhower still completed tasks and missions he was given. Once MacArthur had made up his mind, Ike carried out the task or mission to the best of his abilities.

Eisenhower’s sense of duty, like Marshall’s, was ideologically based on supporting the Constitution, and this was something that he believed was his duty and something that he was honor bound to fulfill. He also believed that leaders needed to teach subordinates this, as well as how vitally important it was for each soldier to fulfill their respective duty. Eisenhower stated, “The officer’s primary task [is] to produce voluntary self-restraint in his men by setting a convincing example of selfless devotion to duty.”¹⁶ He demonstrated this type of ideologically focused sense of duty when his father died while he was deployed during World War II. Puryear notes that Ike’s father died in March 1942, but that his sense of duty, even in this traumatic time, was overwhelming. He provides the following statement about this from Eisenhower, “I have felt terribly. I should have liked so much to be with my mother these few days. But we’re at war. And war is not soft; it has not time to indulge even the deepest and most sacred emotions.”¹⁷ Clearly, his duties as a Soldier came first and his duties to his family came second.

In letters he wrote to his son John, he often emphasized how important fulfilling one's duty was in the military. In one such letter he stated, "[T]he only unforgivable sin in war is not doing your duty when you know what it is. To attempt to say that duty is unimportant and inconsequential and, therefore, one may neglect it, is to be guilty - at least in principle - of the biggest crime a soldier can commit." He continued,

Some day you will be commanding a platoon or a battery. The one thing you are going to depend upon is a certain knowledge that every soldier in your unit will do what you tell him, whether you are watching him or not. If you cannot be certain, then you do not have a unit and you have failed to develop a battle-worthy organization.¹⁸

Stressing the importance of duty in combat, Eisenhower stated, "In combat regions...the capacity of the Allied soldier to perform his duty quietly and efficiently, enduring hardship and privation, and hourly facing danger with a determination and confidence, often even a cockiness, ...never [seemed] to desert him." Further, he stated,

In a platoon or in a battalion, if there is any sign of hesitation or shirking on the part of any individual, it must be quickly and sternly repressed. Soldiers will not follow any battle leader with confidence unless they know that he will require full performance of duty from every member of the team. When bullets are flying and every man's safety and welfare depend upon every other man in the team doing his job, men will not accept a weakling as their leader.¹⁹

Like Marshall, Eisenhower's moral sense of obligation to fulfill his duty as a husband was second in priority to his duties as an officer. Consequently this kept him and his wife Mamie apart many times. He nonetheless fulfilled his responsibilities to his wife and was always able to keep their relationship held together strongly. His marital fidelity to his wife, however, was challenged during and after the war. Thus, because he was the de facto civil-military religious and moral leader of American forces in Europe during this time, this accusation must be addressed. Some insinuated that Eisenhower committed adultery during World War II, while he served as the Supreme Allied

Commander in Europe. The accusation was that he had an affair with his British driver, Mrs. Kay Summersby. When she was detailed to serve as Ike's driver, she was a divorcée who was engaged and soon to remarry another man.²⁰ As Ambrose notes, "In Ike's mind, his relationship with Kay was perfectly innocent and lots of fun. He deeply resented but would not comment upon the gossip, just as having Kay's presence singled out left him furious but helpless."²¹ Unfortunately for Eisenhower, he was the center of attention in Europe during the war, and his every move was scrutinized and reported in the press. As a result, he sometimes had to address gossip in order to quash rumors, such as those about him and Kay. Ambrose notes that because of these types of rumors, Eisenhower wrote Mamie a letter and stated, "I've liked some-been somewhat intrigued by others-but haven't been in love with anyone else and don't want any other wife."²² Because of letters such as this, Mamie believed her husband, despite the continued rumors about his possible marital infidelity. Ambrose notes that, decades after the war and after her death, Kay had a book published in which she stipulated that she and Ike had a "passionate but unconsummated romance, partly because...they were seldom alone together, mainly because...Eisenhower was flaccid." He also points out that if true, this likely occurred because of Ike's "stern sense of morality overrode his passion."²³ He also correctly highlights that "it may be an incident that never happened, that it was merely an old woman's fantasy. No one will ever know. What is important to note is that not even Kay ever claimed that they had a genuine love affair."²⁴ The evidence seems clear enough that the two of them enjoyed each others company, but that was the extent of their relationship. It also seems fair to surmise that Eisenhower may have been tempted by her. The overriding deduction, however, is that it seems sufficiently evident

that he did not commit adultery with Summersby, and therefore this unnecessary and slanderous caveat to his past should not mar his record nor besmirch his superb leadership skills. In addition, he should not be slighted and maligned as a morally bankrupt military leader who was unfaithful to his wife.

Both Marshall and Eisenhower were faithful to their spouses, morally and religiously focused, and therefore served as military leaders who were sentinels of national morality. Both would also agree that leaders who are unfaithful to their spouses demonstrate their lack of moral focus and are morally bankrupt and not worthy to lead others. First and foremost, by breaking a covenant they have made between them and God, they have demonstrated a lack of integrity and honor. Second, they have also demonstrated that they can not be civil-military religious leaders with a leadership style that is morally focused. Soldiers need moral focus and, as was mentioned earlier, this moral focus leads to good discipline in times of both peace and war. Leaders with a moral focus become sentinels of national morality for the army and teach their Soldiers to act likewise. In addition, it is difficult if not impossible for leaders to ever again have trust and confidence in the abilities of morally bankrupt Soldiers. UCMJ Article 134 clearly stipulates the negative impact that adultery has in the military. As noted in the Article, “Adultery is clearly unacceptable conduct, and it reflects adversely on the service record of the military member.” Also this UCMJ article stipulates that adultery is “conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline or of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces.”²⁵

Both Marshall and Eisenhower were honorable and faithful civil-military religious leaders with clear moral focus. Both understood their duties to the Constitution, their

families, their faiths, and their direct supervisors. It is also clear that both understood they had to set the example for others to follow. Their adherence to their duties served as a beacon for those they led and helped maintain discipline in the army during both peace time and in war.

Leadership Style and Discipline

Much like the importance of duty to an officer's leadership style, discipline is also something that each officer should carefully consider. Discipline needs to be incorporated in to each officer's leadership style because it provides direction to those they lead when times are tough. Soldiers need to know that their leaders are disciplined and unwavering in their leadership. They need to know that routine, disciplined behavior is expected because it instills confidence in Soldiers and this has always proved necessary in combat. Discipline enables a tireless work ethic and adherence to duty, and it reinforces attention to detail and training that becomes routine and reinforced. In short, discipline goes hand in hand with duty and keeps Soldiers focused and alive in combat and mission and training oriented in times of peace. It is therefore imperative that each officer carefully considers their understanding of discipline and how it relates to them, their leadership style, and those they lead. Marshall's and Eisenhower's views on discipline provide insight into their leadership styles.

Marshall's Views Regarding Discipline

Marshall's views on discipline can be examined both by looking at his sense of self discipline and by looking at his views of how leaders needed to instill discipline with troops. The discipline he imposed on himself provides a vantage point to understand how

he disciplined troops. Likely out of fear of failure, Marshall trained his mind to quickly prioritize and intensely focus on pressing issues. This sense of focus helped him develop clear and focused decisions, but it also made him somewhat intolerant of those who were inefficient with his and their time. He took his responsibilities as a leader seriously and that helped him develop this intense focus.

To those who had to work with or brief Marshall, he was described as distant, curt, unapproachable and thus sometimes mean-spirited and confrontational. That is, however, the quintessential Marshall, a man driven to succeed as a leader and driven to do his duty, a facet of his leadership that he viewed as something to which he was honor bound. He accepted his duties and the burdens that came with them. He was serious and focused to a fault, as many others have expressed, but this dogged determination was a part of Marshall's leadership style. Once he started taking classes at VMI, he knew that he was going to find a way to succeed to complete the task of graduating from this school. He knew that he had challenges as a student, but he also knew that he was at school instead of working at a mundane job, and he knew it was his duty to complete his education. For him, that meant he needed to discipline himself in order to understand how to learn. He was able to do that and by his senior year, he had risen to the highest cadet post he could achieve. Cray also notes that when Marshall attended the Army Staff College, "After each day's classes and field exercises, Marshall beat for his home...to dinner with Lily and her mother, then to waiting books. He put in long hours, went late to bed, then often awoke in the middle of the night, anxious about the score on a test he had taken, nervous about the exam coming up."²⁶ Further, according to Cray, his second wife, Katherine, noted that he would speak to himself on their walks. She said, "I had the

feeling he was really talking to himself. It was as though he lived outside of himself and George Marshall was someone he was constantly appraising, advising, and training to meet a situation.”²⁷ These examples clearly show a Soldier and a leader that is focused and disciplined about fulfilling his duties. It is also clear that once he satisfied his first priority duties, he completed the duties to his wives with as much enthusiasm. Indeed, Marshall emulated a well disciplined mind, and he lived a disciplined lifestyle both as a Soldier and as a husband.

Marshall understood the necessity of discipline for all Soldiers in the army. As a leader, he maintained strict discipline with his troops, and he trained his troops to be disciplined with regard to their duties while in the army. He understood the value that discipline provided both leaders and subordinates in the army and he always pushed this concept. Regarding the importance of discipline for Soldiers in battle, Marshall stated, “The necessity for discipline is never fully comprehended by the soldier until he has undergone the ordeal of battle, and even then he lacks a basis of comparison-the contrast between the action of a disciplined regiment and the failure and probable disintegration of one which lacks that intangible quality.”²⁸ In addition, Marshall once stated that, “There was a need for leadership and discipline and spirit to supply the element that made men fight.” Marshall knew that winning battles and wars required determination, and he knew that in order to have this, troops must have discipline.

For Marshall, though, this was not the type of discipline that he endured as a Soldier. Pogue notes that Marshall described the type of discipline he received as an older type of discipline. Marshall added that it “was the objective of all that monotonous drilling which, to be honest, achieved obedience at the expense of initiative. It excluded

‘thought’ of any kind. As an old drill sergeant put it one day, ‘Give me control of the instinct and you can have the reason.’” This same first sergeant made a lasting impression on Marshall shortly after he took his first command in the Philippines. Cray notes that one of Marshall’s soldiers was grouching about shoveling coal during a torrential rain storm. Marshall’s First Sergeant quickly engaged the Soldier and said, “Keep your mouth shut and shovel coal; that’s your job.”²⁹ For Marshall this made a lasting impression that Soldiers need to be disciplined to fulfill their duties in difficult circumstances and this can only happen if Soldiers are properly disciplined. In fact, a short while later, Marshall employed this type of discipline with his troops during the crossing of a crocodile infested river. During the crossing, one of his men yelled “crocodile!” and this led to disorganization, panic, and his men fleeing to the banks on both sides of the river. Noticing the obvious lack of discipline with his troops, Marshall did not get mad but rather regrouped his men, called them into formation, and then led them back and forth across the river amid the supposed crocodiles. This was clearly an application of his understanding of the older type of discipline reinforced by his First Sergeant.

To be sure, his views on discipline changed as his career progressed. As the Chief of Staff of the Army during war time and with hundreds of thousands of draftees he developed a view on discipline that was less harsh. He did not believe that this was the type of army that the United States now needed. In fact, as Pogue notes, Marshall added, “Theirs not to reason why-theirs but to do or die” was an antiquated approach. He believed that Soldiers instead needed the type of discipline that was based on “respect rather than fear; on the effect of good example given by officers; on the intelligent

comprehension by all ranks of why an order has to be and why it must be carried out; on a sense of duty, on esprit de corps.”³⁰ Marshall pushed for a newer and better way to teach troops how to be disciplined in battle. His more humane, reasoning, and intelligent approach to training and teaching new Soldiers about duty and discipline demonstrated a genuine, clear, and forward thinking approach about the army. Like Marshall, Eisenhower had an equally strong concern for discipline in the army.

Eisenhower’s Views Regarding Discipline

From Eisenhower’s perspective, discipline and duty were closely connected and were extremely important in the military. He stated, “Discipline and duty were the antidotes to complacency for soldiers and civilians alike. In wartime, [they were] the first tenet of the soldier’s religion.”³¹ In addition, he believed strict, purposeful, and fair discipline was essential for soldiers to fulfill their duty. In another letter to his son John, Ike referred to the discipline taught at West Point. He stated, “Cadets jeer at the disciplinary standards the Tactical Department is always trying to instill in them. But I tell you this – if I could have in this entire force, today, the discipline of the United States Corps of Cadets, I could shorten up this campaign immeasurably. Discipline wins battles.” Later in that same letter he stated,

Discipline is that quality in an organization that gives the Commander the assurance that every man in it will do exactly as he is told and will not deviate from that path, except under circumstances he also knows his Commander could not have foreseen and in which circumstances he also knows that the Commander would expect him to use his own judgment. Discipline makes a man salute – it also makes him hang on to his machine-gun, firing it to the last round in the face of what appears to be an overwhelming attack.... Discipline is the thing that distinguishes the army from a mob.³²

These are interesting comments considering that, as a cadet at West Point, Eisenhower

had a terrible discipline record. Yet, he cautioned his son against behaving similarly. In fact, in one letter Ike reminded John about a deal the two of them had made regarding smoking while at the academy. As mentioned earlier, smoking was against the rules while Ike attended West Point, and he frequently broke that rule and often received punishment for doing so. Even though smoking is not a serious offense, it requires discipline to give up that habit in order to follow academy rules. To help his son avoid making the same mistake, he offered him \$1.50 per week not to smoke while he was a cadet. He pointed out that “the deal was to go on until [John] was twenty-five, if [he] had not taken up smoking as a habit by that time.”³³ From this letter it is possible to infer that, although he had a poor discipline record while he was a cadet, he realized how important discipline was for Soldiers and how vitally important it was for success in battle. In fact he once stated, “[D]iscipline was the sine qua non of every successful alliance, from the alliance of a few soldiers in a squad to the alliance of great nations in a United Nations.”³⁴ Eisenhower’s advice to his son seems to indicate that he may not have understood that part of what enabled him to develop such a successful leadership philosophy was his ability to evaluate and even challenge rules or doctrine from a common sense and fair perspective.

Eisenhower believed that well-disciplined military units, which were led by leaders who were respected by their men, were essential for military success in battle. In order to help his subordinate leaders train and evaluate the discipline of their troops, Ike listed standards to measure discipline. As Ambrose points out, “He believed that there were certain constants by which the state of discipline could be judged: standards of military courtesy, bearing and carriage of soldiers, and neatness in clothing and

appearance.”³⁵

In another letter to John written a couple of months later, he elaborated in more detail about his views regarding discipline in the military. He stated,

We sometimes use the term ‘soul of an army.’ That soul is nothing but discipline, and discipline is simply the certainty that every man will obey orders promptly, cheerfully, and effectively. A disciplined army can be taught technic [sic] very rapidly, but all the technic [sic] in the world will do you no good when the bullets are flying and the bombs are dropping, unless you have discipline.... Discipline is the product of hard and unrelenting and unremitting work. Just plain sweat.³⁶

After World War II was over, Eisenhower commented again on the importance of discipline during a speech he gave at a graduation ceremony for Reserved Officer Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) cadets at Texas Agricultural and Mechanical Arts (A&M) University. In his speech, he paraphrased comments Major General John M. Schofield made about discipline in a speech he gave to West Point cadets in 1887. Schofield stated,

The discipline [that] makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army. He who feels the respect which is due others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself; while he who feels disrespect towards others...cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself.³⁷

Eisenhower’s comments about discipline are as important in men and women serving in the armed services today as they were when he was in the army. Today’s army is very focused on training, professional competence, and cutting edge technology in order to maintain a professional and technologically advanced army. However, as Eisenhower pointed out, training is secondary to discipline, and in order to be an effective leader, it is first necessary to develop a strong sense of discipline within one’s unit. Discipline must precede training because the purpose of training is to get ready for war, and without an established sense of discipline to implement that training during difficult times, training is ineffective and time is wasted.

Politics in the Army and Its Impact on Discipline

Politics can also impact Soldier discipline. It is not an uncommon aspect of American life to have an interest in politics; in fact, the freedom to openly express political opinions and support particular political views is one of the great aspects of American life that the citizens of other countries envy about America. This freedom, however, has to be quelled for those that serve in the military. In the United States, the military is supposed to be apolitical because it was designed to be led by the President of the United States, an elected civilian leader that serves as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.³⁸ Thus, regardless of the political party, or background and political views of the person elected as the President, members of the military must legally support the Constitution and obey the lawful orders of the President. Ambrose correctly states that “the tradition in the Army was to deny that it was ever involved in any way in politics. ...The Army and Army officers were supposed to be above politics.”³⁹ Puryear goes even further when he notes, “Traditionally the military officer is completely disassociated from politics. He takes no sides in political disputes, he does not run for office, [and] often he does not vote.” He also states that “It is part of our national code that the military is subordinate to the President, his key cabinet officers and, most of all, to the people.”⁴⁰ These are valid points, and it is therefore not too large of an assumption to make that military discipline can and would be compromised if Soldiers of any rank aligned themselves with a particular politician, political views, or political party.

The ideal of serving apolitically in the military was first emulated in the American military by General George Washington, who has often been portrayed as the American farmer called to military service. This portrayal is akin to the legendary Roman hero

Cincinnatus, who was a Roman farmer without political leanings who answered Rome's call for military service.⁴¹ After he had fulfilled his military support, he was given authority to rule Rome and did so only long enough for an elected leader to take over. A legend has therefore been created that he was the first true citizen Soldier, apolitical and selfless in service and the ideal for which all Soldiers should aspire. The obvious reason why Soldiers should be apolitical is that not everyone shares the same political views. Thus, once Soldiers identify their political leanings, they may instantly have supporters within their unit, but they will also just as quickly have those that will not support them because of their political views. Regarding this issue, Puryear notes that General MacArthur made the following comments in a speech he gave to West Point cadets on May 12, 1962,

Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government. ...These great national problems are not for your professional participation or military solution. Your guidepost stands out like a ten-fold beacon in the night, Duty-Honor-Country.⁴²

Although MacArthur did not always follow his own advice, he did nicely summarize and remind Soldiers that they need to stay out of politics while they are in the military. If a Soldier did become politically outspoken, then a breakdown in discipline would likely occur. For example, how would a leader be perceived by their subordinates if he or she expressed a political opinion or support of a particular politician or political party when some of those subordinates had diametrically different political views? Could that impact job performance or job opportunities in the military? Could it influence promotion boards? Would it result in investigations by the Inspector General? How would discipline be affected by Soldiers in a unit that completely opposed the elected Commander-in-Chief? This of course occurred for part of American armed forces during

the American Civil War and, as a result, the military has addressed this issue legally in the UCMJ and in subsequent Department of Defense directives.⁴³

Eisenhower and Marshall differed on their views regarding Soldier involvement in politics. One of Marshall's concerns regarding discipline within the army centered around Soldier involvement in politics. He believed that political activity in the army was inherently dangerous and would undermine the apolitical relationship the military had with the American government. Stoler notes that Marshall "firmly believed...that political activity was antithetical to his professional responsibilities and values, and that officers should have nothing to do with partisan politics."⁴⁴ Puryear notes that "When he was asked, on occasion, during his military career about his political allegiance he replied humorously, 'My father was a Democrat, my mother was a Republican, and I am an Episcopalian.'"⁴⁵ Noticeably, Marshall went out of his way to avoid any connection with politics or political disputes. In fact, while in uniform, he never voted. Stoler also points out that, "Throughout his life, he refused on principle to accept any nomination for elective posts or even to vote in any election."⁴⁶ Marshall expressed his concern about how discipline could be affected by Soldiers involved in political discourse. When speaking of Soldiers who engage in political discourse or sign petitions to influence how the military is run, he wanted to squash this type of action. Marshall stated, "We cannot have a political club and call it an army." He believed that Soldiers who acted in such a manner should be prosecuted to ensure discipline in the Army is maintained. Marshall also then added, "Without discipline an army is not only impotent...it is a menace to the state."⁴⁷ He understood the impact that politics had on military discipline, and it appears as though he genuinely led by Cincinnatus and Washington examples.

When his mentor, supporter, and friend, General Pershing considered running for political office in 1919, Marshall was shocked and depressed about this surprising turn of events. Neither had ever voted and both agreed, according to Stoler, that politically activity by officers was divisive to the officer corps and therefore detrimental to the military. Marshall therefore confronted Pershing and expressed his dismay. Stoler points out that Marshall told Pershing that he opposed his campaign to win the Republican nomination for the presidency, and that he believed his prestige would be diminished if he failed to win.⁴⁸ Since Pershing did not achieve his political goal, Marshall's comments were remarkably accurate. Marshall's views were reinforced when, in 1944, he was publicly recommended by congressmen and journalists as a possible candidate in the pending general election. Cray notes that Democratic Senator Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado stated, "the Democratic Party owes it to the people to draft Gen. Marshall for President. He is not a candidate and he will emphatically say so, but no patriotic American from George Washington down can refuse such a call."⁴⁹ Senator Johnson's comments were well crafted, telling, and politically loaded. In one speech, he had confirmed to the public that Marshall should be recognized as an apolitical military leader in the mold of George Washington. Marshall's subsequent silence about the Senator's comments was equally telling. Cray notes that when Senator Johnson later publicly reminded Marshall that he "had not thanked him for putting his name forward, Marshall answered, 'No, Senator, I certainly did not.'"⁵⁰ In addition, Marshall also later warned Eisenhower about seeking elected public office. Cray notes that Marshall had "counseled him to forsake any interest in politics or political preferment as inconsistent with the career of a professional soldier."⁵¹ This advice to Eisenhower, however, seems

to have fallen on deaf ears.

Marshall's lack of interest in seeking elected public office does not mean that he did not know how to maneuver in political channels to get things accomplished, which he did so extremely effectively. In fact, he had tremendous success working with politicians in Washington, D.C. While he served as the Army Chief of Staff from 1939 to 1945, he had remarkable achievements with Congress in his efforts to expand and modernize the army. Cray notes that Marshall had "raised and equipped an army and air force of almost 7 million men and women; in the last two years [he] had fielded fifty combat divisions. More were to come each month. His air force had grown thirty-five fold, to 2 million men and more than 100,000 aircraft of all types."⁵² Getting appropriations from Congress for this type of growth took an apolitical leader such as Marshall. He made it clear to politicians that he was apolitical and focused on his mission for the Army. Stoler notes that "Marshall exuded a combination of self-discipline, knowledge, total honesty, and frankness that seemed to mesmerize as well as astound and reassure congressmen." He also adds that Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, once stated about Marshall that "He would tell the truth even if it hurt his cause. Congress always respected him for this and would give him things they would give no one else."⁵³ Undoubtedly, Marshall's career-long apolitical posture endeared him to Congress while he served as the Army Chief of Staff. His lack of political ambition made him transparent to Congress and the American people. As a result, his testimonies before Congress as well as his other dealings with congressmen were viewed as frank, honest, factual, and non partisan. In summary, his Cincinnati and Washington approach to military service enabled him to effectively and efficiently expand the army.

Eisenhower also intentionally kept politics at an arms length and worked at not getting himself fenced into a particular political party. That does not mean, however, that Eisenhower was not interested in politics and eventually running for elected office. He was interested, although he wanted Soldiers and others to see him as completely detached from politics. In a recorded conversation between Eisenhower and historian Robert Sherwood in 1944, Puryear notes Eisenhower mentioned that he had never voted. He also points out that Ike mentioned that, “He felt that since an Army officer must serve his government with full loyalty and devotion regardless of it political coloration, he should avoid all consideration of political partisanship.”⁵⁴ These remarks clearly demonstrate that Eisenhower wanted to be perceived as following Washington’s and now Marshall’s example and wanted to keep himself out of politics. This, however, might not present an accurate understanding of Eisenhower’s political aspirations. There is some evidence to suggest that, as a military officer, Ike had a strong interest in politics, and that he was usually clever enough to conceal his interest and political views. It appears that he privately discussed his political views and ambitions with some officers. Ambrose notes that Ike was indoctrinated in crossing the lines between military and politics while he worked for MacArthur. Regarding his time with MacArthur, Ike stated, “My duties were beginning to verge on the political, even to the edge of partisan politics.”⁵⁵ Unlike Marshall, however, Eisenhower liked crossing military-political lines to get issues resolved, but he did so in an almost covert way. In sum, he wanted to engage politically, he just did not want to be seen as political, nor did he want to risk the repercussions for political missteps. Eisenhower’s interest in politics was evident in a conversation he had with White House correspondent Merriman Smith in 1962. Ambrose notes that

Eisenhower believed he was speaking with Smith off-the-record and made the following statement,

I have been in politics, the most active sort of politics, most of my adult life. There's no more active political organization in the world than the armed services of the U.S. As a matter of fact, I think I am a better politician than most so called politicians.⁵⁶

This is peculiar and clearly hypocritical of his earlier comments because there are countless examples in which Ike has blatantly denied any interest in politics. For example, Ambrose notes that, in 1945, Eisenhower wrote a friend stating, "I must tell you, with all the emphasis I can command, that nothing could be so distasteful to me as to engage in political activity of any kind. I trust that no friend of mine will ever attempt to put me in the position where I would even be called upon to deny political ambitions."⁵⁷ These examples demonstrate that Eisenhower held duplicitous views on politics. Plainly, Ike's views regarding political activity in the military and how it affects discipline contrasted with Marshall's views about politics and this was a noted departure in thinking between the two leaders and their leadership styles. In fact, when Eisenhower received the Republican presidential nomination in 1952, as Pogue notes, Ike stated, "If he had suggested this outcome ten years earlier, Marshall would have had him locked up as dangerous."⁵⁸ Stoler adds that Marshall "might have also dismissed [Eisenhower] as lacking in character had he known what Eisenhower would do, or rather retreat from doing, in the ensuing political campaign."⁵⁹ While these two fine leaders ended their careers with divergent views on the impact politics has on the military, both shared the same views regarding subordinates.

Leadership Style and Subordinates

With the same importance that leaders consider how duty and discipline factor into their leadership style, they must also consider how they will work with subordinate officers and enlisted Soldiers. Maintaining a clear line of separation is vital for the good order and discipline of the military, but that line for some leaders is not always easy to delineate. Most leaders today fall on either end of the spectrum when it comes to dealing with subordinates, either they are too draconian and cold and their Soldiers feel distant from them or they are too friendly and easy going and their Soldiers feel as though they are a push over. Regardless of the approach taken with subordinates, officers should always fulfill their duties, complete their missions, and take care of those that they lead. Their leadership with subordinates helps Soldiers understand their duty, their need for discipline and a tireless work ethic, and their need to live morally focused lives. Indeed, this aspect of leadership style is vital while Soldiers are in uniform, and it is likely one of the main things they speak of when they are out of uniform. If officers do not carefully consider this aspect of their leadership style, then those they lead will assess it for them, and by then it will be too late for that officer. Marshall and Eisenhower provide different leadership style approaches regarding subordinates.

Marshall's Views Regarding Subordinates

Marshall was cold, aloof, and stern with his subordinates. He wanted them to see him as a serious leader focused on the mission at hand. He also wanted them to know that he seriously cared about both their physical and spiritual well being. Stoler notes that Marshall's subordinates many times viewed him as paternalistic but that he could sometimes come across as a "stuffed shirt and a prudish bore." In addition, Stoler also

points out that when with subordinates, “He never told off-color stories and could wither with a stare anyone who did or who otherwise violated his Victorian moral code.”⁶⁰ To help cement this clear separation of leader and subordinate, Marshall established certain protocols, one worth mentioning is what he expected of those Soldiers that briefed him.

According to Pogue, Marshall had a unique routine for engaging with subordinate officers in his office. He expected an officer that was ordered to report to his office to enter on time, walk uninvited to the desk, and without saluting or speaking take a seat in the chair placed in front of and center of Marshall’s desk. When Marshall raised his head and looked at the officer that was the officer’s cue to start speaking. Unblinkingly and in silence, Marshall stared at the officer providing the briefing, and all the while he displayed a nervous tic near his mouth. Pogue notes that Marshall developed this tic during World War I and that it “pulled up one corner of his mouth in a grimace that the unwary often mistook for a smile.”⁶¹ Despite his cold and serious gaze and unexplainable tic, he would nonetheless listen intently until he was either bored or felt he needed to interject, and then he would ask probing questions about the briefing or dismiss the briefer outright. After Marshall felt as though he had asked enough questions, he would abruptly end the meeting and turn to continue whatever it was he was working on prior to the meeting. This served as a cue for the officer to leave. Pogue also notes that officers who experienced this routine by Marshall viewed it as rude.⁶² If an officer was self-serving, overly long or vague with explanations, unprepared, clumsy in speech, or did not provide a direct answer to direct questions Marshall asked, then Marshall dismissed him. If the officer engaged Marshall, but was not prepared Marshall was not averse to privately dressing down that Soldier, which sometimes involved violent tirades.

Pogue illustrates, however, that red-faced, hand waving rage was rare for Marshall; instead, he could deliver as powerful a sentiment with quiet, icy consternation.⁶³

Mistakes by officers that led to either outburst usually resulted in a reassignment.

In short, Marshall did not mind hearing from subordinate officers, and he expected them to freely speak their minds. However, he wanted officers that briefed him to be articulate, concise, and be able to provide well researched answers to his questions. If he asked a question that they were not ready for, the best they response they could give would be that they would research the answer and replay as soon as possible. Trying to circuitously answer a question would only be negatively received by Marshall. John T. Nelson notes that “From his staff he subsequently demanded concise, articulate reports and studies which addressed issues in a frank, straight-forward fashion. He was exceptionally impatient of excess verbiage and set very high standards in this regard.” Nelson also adds that “He grew irritated at the slightest sign of muddled thinking or articulation. He expected issues to be presented to him logically, lucidly, and succinctly.”⁶⁴ This rough manner of dealing with subordinate officers was Marshall’s method of teaching subordinates to be prepared and to take their jobs seriously. Marshall was a teacher by nature, and he had extensive experience training and teaching cadets at VMI and Soldiers at Fort Leavenworth and elsewhere. Pogue points out that Marshall therefore inspired his subordinate officers to do their best.⁶⁵ Nelson also illustrates that despite this harsh teacher mentality that Marshall established he was “extremely tolerant of honest mistakes born of taking initiative and usually supported and encouraged subordinates.”⁶⁶

Despite his high standards for his staff and junior officers, Marshall ardently

supported subordinate officers and enlisted Soldiers, whether he was in charge of them or not. Many times he would go to extreme measures to assist subordinates. Nelson highlights that for Marshall caring for Soldiers meant having “leaders who persistently looked after their men’s welfare and who helped attack the great destroyers of morale- inadequate creature comforts, boredom, and a sense of unfair treatment.”⁶⁷ If he initiated something to help Soldiers then it was something he expected to be accomplished immediately. He would not accommodate delays or excuses for initiatives not being seen through to completion. For example, while serving as Chief of Staff of the Army in 1941, he visited Fort Benning for an inspection and one of his aides, Sergeant James W. Powder, was approached by a company first sergeant about getting extra blankets for his men in the field. Although this request had not been vetted through the proper chain of commands, it was something that Marshall wanted taken care of as soon as possible, and he gave the sergeant who had made the request his word that he would get them. A few weeks later, Marshall again visited Fort Benning and the same first sergeant again approached Marshall’s aide, Sergeant Powder, and asked him if he had forgotten about the blankets. When Marshall was later informed of this, he was very upset and when he returned to his office in Washington, D.C. he met with his Quartermaster staff and asked them to explain to him why there was a delay. According to Pogue, Marshall became enraged with the bureaucratic, paper shuffling type of answer his staff presented. They noted that the request had been side stepped because proper request forms had not been submitted, and they also added that the matter was being taken care of and that it was not something to be concerned about. Pogue notes that Marshall made the following comments,

I am not worried about not hearing any more about it, I want the matter arranged. Get these blankets and stoves and every other damn thing that's needed out tonight, not tomorrow morning, and not two weeks from now. I don't care what regulations are upset or anything of that character. We are going to take care of troops first, last, and all the time.⁶⁸

Taking care of subordinates in this matter was not simply vying for popularity votes. He was not looking to win over junior officers or enlisted Soldiers. Rather, he understood legitimate Soldier grousing, and he knew what it was like to be cold in the field and trying to Soldier. For Marshall, the concept of reading the needs of subordinates was a requirement for successful leaders. Subordinates knew this as well, and Marshall realized that those officers that addressed the legitimate concerns were respected by those that they led. He would not tolerate indifference or unwillingness by officers to support the subordinates that worked for them. In fact, as Pogue points out, Marshall believed that "Soldiers will tolerate almost anything in an officer except unfairness and ignorance. They are quick to detect either."⁶⁹

Marshall's emphasis on supporting subordinates was a passion for him. He was very focused on addressing problems within the army, and he believed that junior officers and enlisted Soldiers, when given the opportunity to speak, would provide a list of the relevant issues that needed to be addressed. Pogue notes that Marshall visited training facilities around the United States to get this sort of perspective. From these visits and conversations with troops, he became concerned about the morale of Soldiers. As mentioned earlier, this was partially a concern about their spiritual well-being. It was also, however, a concern for what Soldiers ate, how they were housed, how they were promoted, their health, and most importantly how they were treated by those officers leading them. Pogue notes that Marshall realized that many commanders and leaders

were too singularly focused on preparing men to fight in Europe and in the Pacific.⁷⁰ He did not, however, want them to lose sight of their other responsibilities regarding Soldier development. To emphasize his concern for this, in 1941 he created a new brigadier general position called the Morale Officer and made him head of the Morale Branch on the General Staff. The purpose of this staff, as Nelson notes, “was to coordinate morale-related activities, needs, and services more efficiently across the entire Army.” Marshall then instituted a policy and stated that “Morale is primarily a function of command.”⁷¹ He then followed that by, as Pogue notes, comments that put commanders “on notice that they would be held strictly responsible for eliminating those issues that created special problems.”⁷² Part of the reason Marshall focused on addressing the needs of subordinates and enlisted men in particular was that, as Cray notes, “He had...seen the destruction of morale by officers insensitive to the needs of their men.” Cray also added that Marshall believed that “It [was] morale that wins victory.”⁷³ Another element that must be factored into Marshall’s emphasis on morale is that the Selective Service Act of 1940 had recently passed, and the army was now partially made up of draftees. These were not men who volunteered to join the army, they were forced to serve and Marshall recognized that the old methods of instilling discipline and training men to fight had to change.

Eisenhower’s Views Regarding Subordinates

Eisenhower was equally focused on developing subordinate leaders and caring for Soldiers, but his approach with them was less harsh and less cold than Marshall’s. He was approachable, smiled frequently, and was therefore perceived as a warmer person than Marshall. He believed that leaders and subordinates needed to feel a sense of

partnership and confidence with one another in order to get the army's business done. In fact, Eisenhower stated,

The one quality that can be developed by studious reflection and practice is the leadership of men. The idea is to get people to working together, not only because you tell them to do so and enforce your orders but because they instinctively want to do it for you.... Essentially, you must be devoted to duty, sincere, fair, and cheerful. You do not need to be a glad-hander[sic] nor a salesman, but your men must trust you and instinctively wish to win your approbation and to avoid things that call upon you for correction.⁷⁴

One way for leaders to effectively implement this aspect of Eisenhower's leadership style is to consider what subordinates are looking for in a good leader.

Eisenhower considered this approach and in the previously mentioned graduation speech to R.O.T.C. cadets at Texas A&M University, Ike discussed a survey regarding what leadership qualities enlisted soldiers considered most important in a good officer. He stated that, "The two most important leadership traits that enlisted soldiers want in officers is demonstrated competence in their field and an interest for the welfare and benefit of the men with which they are responsible."⁷⁵ In Eisenhower's opinion, "The soldier's welfare is always the business of commanders of all grades."⁷⁶ Truly caring for soldiers is an essential skill of good military leadership. Ike often risked his life to visit the front lines just to check on soldiers and let them know that he and their immediate commanders were aware of their hardships.

In addition to checking on their welfare, direct communications with troops helped Eisenhower gain important military intelligence regarding battles, logistics management information, troop morale, and in some instances new ideas. In battle, by frequently communicating with the enlisted men, especially veterans, Ike believed he gained an accurate impression of the battle and their state of mind. A favorite question

Ike asked was whether that particular squad or platoon had figured out any new trick or gadget for use in infantry fighting. He believed that “among the mass of individuals who carry the rifles in war, [there is] a great amount of ingenuity and initiative.” Ike also stated, “[N]o talk with a soldier or group of soldiers was ever profitless for me.”⁷⁷ In addition, Eisenhower believed that soldiers who deal day to day with the problems of war develop better ways of doing things and thereby better ways to fight and win battles. After the war, he commented on the adaptability and resourcefulness of American soldiers, stressing that this was what made them so formidable in battle. He stated that, “Experience in battle does not engender any love of the battlefield.... [However, veterans] become more skillful in the utilization of every advantage offered by firepower, maneuver, and terrain. They acquire a steadiness that is not shaken by the confusion and destruction of battle.”⁷⁸ In another letter to John, Ike conveyed the importance of interacting with subordinates, and he told his son that, for platoon leaders, the secret to real leadership was to personally know every man in his platoon.⁷⁹

A close observer of Eisenhower’s leadership skills during World War II was his Chief of Staff, General Walter Bedell Smith. As Greenstein points out, Smith noticed that,

Eisenhower consulted subordinates as much to win them over as to canvass their views... His personality is such that it impresses itself immediately upon senior subordinates as completely frank, completely honest, very human and very considerate.... He has great patience, and he disdains no advice regardless of source. One of his most successful methods in dealing with individuals is to assume that he himself is lacking in detailed knowledge and liable to make an error and is seeking advice. This is by no means a pose, because he actually values the recommendations and suggestions he receives.⁸⁰

Greenstein also notes that Smith observed, “Subordinates so consulted tended to be highly loyal and to accept Eisenhower’s policies readily, presumably because they were

flattered to be taken seriously and to feel that whatever line of action Eisenhower embarked upon had been informed by consultations with them.” Further, according to Greenstein, Smith stated that, “Eisenhower knew that advice seeking was an effective tool for winning the willing support of those he consulted, even though he might not take their advice.”⁸¹ Thus, with respect to Ike’s leadership style, close and routine interaction with soldiers was beneficial for him and the soldiers he commanded.

In order for that type of interaction between leaders and subordinates to occur, it is important that leaders, especially officers, never give the appearance that they consider themselves better than subordinates, especially enlisted soldiers. With respect to officer and enlisted soldier relationships, Eisenhower noted in part of his speech to the R.O.T.C. cadets at Texas A&M, that training a soldier to become an officer is calculated “to give him a feeling of confidence and sureness, but not an attitude of superiority and snobbishness toward his fellow man.” In addition, he stated,

It is the commander who shares, naturally and unpretentiously in every problem of the group, who gains the confidence of his men and gives to them his own, who shares with them every turn of fortune, who takes no thought of himself until every need of all his men has been accommodated, who learns from them as much as he can teach them, and who expresses in every word and deed his pride of belonging to the whole, that invariably gains for himself the greatest reward that can come to any man.⁸²

In another letter to John, Eisenhower affirmed, “If an officer can keep his position of authority, without ever losing it, and at the same time make his men feel that everything that affects them affects him also, then he will never have any trouble with discipline, training, or effective action.”⁸³

In Ike’s opinion, “If men can naturally and without restraint talk to their officers, the products of their resourcefulness become available to all. Moreover, out of the habit

grows mutual confidence, a feeling of partnership that is the essence of *esprit de corps*. An army fearful of its officers is never as good as one that trusts and confides in its leaders.” In addition, he noted, “The capacity of soldiers for absorbing punishment and enduring privations is almost inexhaustible so long as they believe they are getting a square deal, that their commanders are looking out for them, and that their own accomplishments are understood and appreciated.”⁸⁴

An early example of Eisenhower’s application of this leadership style can be seen in comments made by a junior officer who served with him at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, in 1918, while Eisenhower was a R.O.T.C instructor. The description by this officer illustrates how Ike was able to manage and train subordinates by motivating them through a leadership style that mixed humor and seriousness and at the same time allowed Ike to make a caring and personable connection with soldiers. Greenstein presented the following excerpt from a letter Lieutenant Edward C. Thayer wrote to his mother in January 1918. Lieutenant Thayer wrote,

Our new captain, Eisenhower by name, is, I believe one of the most efficient and best Army officers in the country. He is a...corker and has put more into us in three days than we got in all the previous time we were here... He knows his job, is enthusiastic, can tell us what he wants us to do and is pretty human, though wickedly harsh and abrupt... He gets the fellows’ imagination worked up and hollers and yells and makes us shout and stamp until we go tearing into the air as if we mean business.⁸⁵

Eisenhower actively and sincerely created a partnership exchange with subordinates, both officer and enlisted, and at the same time clearly operated within the military rank hierarchy. He truly believed that this type of working relationship was vital in the army and it therefore was a facet of his leadership style. Considering the egos and concern for power and promotion that are inherent in the military’s rank hierarchy, it is

difficult to lead subordinates in a cooperative spirit and still feel confident that command directives are respected and dutifully executed. Nonetheless, the working relationship Ike practiced is possible in the army provided leaders and subordinates understand their roles and mission.

Delegating authority to subordinates is another important responsibility for leaders. Ultimately, even though a leader may delegate authority to a subordinate, a leader is still responsible for what is accomplished and what fails to get accomplished. Eisenhower believed in the need for effective delegation of authority but not responsibility. With respect to delegating authority to subordinates, he stated,

To command the loyalties and dedication and best efforts of capable and outstanding individuals requires patience, understanding, a readiness to delegate, and an acceptance of responsibility for any honest errors – real or apparent – those associates and subordinates might make.... Principal subordinates must have confidence that they and their positions are widely respected, and the chief must do his part in assuring that this is so.⁸⁶

In addition he stated, “[H]e must be quick to take the blame for anything that goes wrong whether or not it results from his mistake or from an error on the part of a subordinate.”⁸⁷

While he effectively delegated authority, he always accepted responsibility for subordinates under his command. Also, he did not delegate authority to the point that it diluted his own ability to keep the actions of his subordinates in line with his own directives. Further, according to Puryear, Eisenhower stated that, “When you delegate something to a subordinate...it is absolutely your responsibility, and he must understand this. You as a leader must take complete responsibility for what that subordinate does.”⁸⁸

Ike never delegated the promotion of field grade and general officers. Much like Marshall, by controlling which soldiers were promoted to these ranks, Ike was more aware of the capabilities of his key subordinate leaders. Ambrose points out that

Eisenhower did this because “[A]s an old career soldier himself he felt promotion was a serious matter to be treated carefully, but chiefly because promotions-which are in effect assignments of greater responsibility-involve a judgment on and prediction of leadership ability.”⁸⁹ Ike would quietly appraise his key subordinates, all the while maintaining a friendly and warm demeanor. According to Greenstein, “While he exuded impressive personal warmth to associates, he had the capacity to put psychological space between himself and them, unemotionally analyzing their strengths and weaknesses.”⁹⁰ Ambrose also points out that, “Throughout the war he kept a personal list of the officers he thought were doing well and deserved to be promoted. Before making a recommendation to Marshall, however, he checked his opinion of an officer with his senior subordinates.”⁹¹ While he may not have delegated authority over promotions, he did delegate authority over other elements of his command to his staff and, as result, he was very careful about selecting his personal staff.

Eisenhower did not believe in micromanaging his staff or other subordinates; instead, he was an effective macro-manager who delegated authority and expected results, not excuses. In order to be an effective macro-manager, he made sure that he placed subordinates in positions that he believed they could successfully manage. Greenstein points out that during World War II, Ike had to “maximize the effectiveness of subordinates who [had] some personal qualities that [made] them well suited for the tasks that needed to be performed, but who also [had] flaws that undermine[d] their performance.”⁹² Ike assessed each subordinate and tailored his respective job to emphasize the positive and minimize the negative aspects of his leadership. In addition, as the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, he often had to delicately handle subordinate

personalities in order to accomplish a mission and, at the same time, hold the Allied coalition together. In fact, Greenstein points out that Ike was so conscious of the need to effectively manage staff personalities that shortly “after returning to the United States after World War II, he advised West Point Superintendent Maxwell Taylor to introduce a course in ‘practical or applied psychology’ to the military academy curriculum.” Further, Ike stated,

[T]oo frequently we find young officers trying to use empirical and ritualistic methods in the handling of individuals – I think that both theoretical and practical instructions along this line could, at the very least, awaken the majority of Cadets[sic] to the necessity of handling human problems on a human basis and to much to improve leadership and personnel handling in the Army at large.⁹³

In Ike’s opinion good leaders immediately recognize the abilities of their subordinates and the extent to which they believe they need to supervise. He did not agree with the idea that one standard for all applies to subordinates, that is with respect to delegating authority to them. As a result of this thinking, Ike was very careful and methodical about choosing his subordinates. He learned from Marshall that it was vitally important to pick strong subordinates who were offensive minded, optimistic, responsible, and competent enough “to solve their own problems whenever possible and not to get in the habit of passing the buck up.”⁹⁴ In addition, Pach and Richardson note, “He also absorbed Marshall’s managerial philosophy, the two most important tenets of which were these: first, the decision maker must not be distracted by problems that subordinates should resolve for themselves; and second, the assistants must have ready the precise information needed to make decisions.”⁹⁵ By selecting subordinates based on this leadership style, Ike was able to organize an effective, proactive, and results oriented staff. Supporting this idea, Greenstein notes, “From the start of his career, [Eisenhower]

showed a gift for organizational leadership, including choosing people who were well suited for their jobs, or finding jobs to match their qualities.”⁹⁶

In another part of his speech to the R.O.T.C. cadets at Texas A&M, he alluded to the impact of developing a strong command staff by stating, “[G]reat leaders who win tactical victories have done so because they have developed the support of a great organization.” Further, he stated, “The teams and the staffs through which the modern commander absorbs information and exercises authority must be a beautifully interlocked, smooth-working mechanism.”⁹⁷

NOTES

¹ Internet web site. Merriam-Webster On-Line (<http://www.m-w.com/>).

² The following is the Oath for Commissioned Officers as stipulated by the US Army Center for Military History (<http://www.history.army.mil/html/faq/oaths.html>). "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God." (Title 10, US Code; Act of 5 May 1960 replacing the wording first adopted in 1789, with amendment effective 5 October 1962).

³ Puryear, *American Generalship*, 110.

⁴ Cray, 661.

⁵ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 56.

⁶ Weintraub, 122.

⁷ Cray, 33.

⁸ Ibid., 89.

⁹ Stoler, 28.

¹⁰ Ibid. The following information on neurasthenia was taken from the WebMD website (<http://www.webmd.com/mental-health/neurasthenia>). The word "neurasthenia"

is a term that has fallen into disuse among psychiatrists in the United States and Australia. It remains in use in the United Kingdom. Where it is used, it covers a wide spectrum of symptoms including the sensation of pain or of numbness in various parts of the body, chronic fatigue, weakness, anxiety, and fainting. Additional findings associated with this term may include rapid intense heartbeat that may be irregular (palpitations, tachycardia); cold, clammy hands and feet; abnormally rapid breathing (hyperventilating); dizziness or faintness; periodic sighing; and/or sweating for no apparent reason.

¹¹ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*, 62.

¹² Puryear, *American Generalship*, 8.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁴ Perry, 49.

¹⁵ Perry, 50.

¹⁶ IRA, 600.

¹⁷ Puryear, *American Generalship*, 11.

¹⁸ DDE to JSDE, 22 May 1943; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).

¹⁹ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 455, 180.

²⁰ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*, 68.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

²² *Ibid.* 80.

²³ Ambrose, 125.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Internet Web Site, <http://www.army.mil/references/UCMJ/index.html>.

²⁶ Cray, 37.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 227. His first wife Lily died on September 15, 1927.

²⁸ Marshall, *Selected Speeches*, 177.

²⁹ Cray, 32.

³⁰ Pogue, *Ordeal and Hope*, 118.

³¹ IRA, 601.

³² DDE to JSDE, 20 March 1943; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).

³³ DDE to JSDE, 16 August 1943; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).

³⁴ IRA, 601.

³⁵ Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander: The War Years of General Dwight D. Eisenhower* (hereafter *The Supreme Commander*) (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), 60.

³⁶ DDE to JSDE, 22 May 1943.

³⁷ DDE, “R.O.T.C. Graduation Muster Speech” (This speech was presented to R.O.T.C. cadets during a graduation ceremony at Texas Agricultural and Mechanical Arts (hereafter Texas A&M) University, College Station, TX, 21 April 1946), PPP, PF, *Box 192* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).

³⁸ As stipulated in the US Constitution, Article II, Section 2, Clause 1. The following is Section 2: The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. This was taken from the FindLaw Internet search engine at the following Internet address: <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com>.

³⁹ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*, 47.

⁴⁰ Puryear, 320-23.

⁴¹ The following was taken from the Leadership Now website at the following Internet address: <http://www.leadershipnow.com/cincinnatus.html>. Cincinnatus was a Roman statesman who gained fame for his selfless devotion to the republic in a time of crisis and for giving up the reins of power when the crisis was over. Although he was a historical figure, his career has been much embellished by legend. In 458 Cincinnatus was appointed dictator at Rome in order to rescue a consular army that was surrounded by the Aequi on Mount Algidus. When the call to duty came up he was found working his small farm. He accepted the request of the Senate to lead the Roman Army. He defeated the enemy in a single day and celebrated a triumphant return to Rome. Cincinnatus maintained his authority only long enough to bring Rome through the emergency—a mere fifteen days. He then resigned and went back to his farm. Legend has it that Cincinnatus was given a second dictatorship in 439 to check the monarchical ambitions of Spurius Maelius after which he again returned to his farm after the crisis, but most scholars see no factual truth in this story.

⁴² Puryear, 320-21.

⁴³ As stipulated in the Uniform Code of Military Justice and based on DoD Directive 1344.10 June 15, 1990, the following are the parameters of political activity by members of the military: A member on AD may: Register, vote, and express his or her personal opinion on political candidates and issues, but not as a representative of the Armed Forces. Make monetary contributions to a political organization. Attend partisan and nonpartisan political meetings or rallies as a spectator when not in uniform. However, a member on AD shall not: Use his or her official authority or influence for interfering with an election; affecting the course or outcome of an election; soliciting votes for a particular candidate or issue; or requiring or soliciting political contributions from others. Be a candidate for, or hold, civil office except as authorized in subsections D.2. and D.3. Participate in partisan political management, campaigns, or conventions. Make campaign contributions to another r of the Armed Forces or an employee of the Federal Government.

⁴⁴ Stoler, 24.

⁴⁵ Puryear, 321.

⁴⁶ Stoler, 24.

⁴⁷ Marshall, *Selected Speeches*, 149.

⁴⁸ Stoler 46-47.

⁴⁹ Cray, 403.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid., 638.

⁵² Ibid., 402.

⁵³ Stoler, 77.

⁵⁴ Puryear, 321.

⁵⁵ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* , 47.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* , 208-9.

⁵⁸ Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Statesman, 1945-1959* (New York: Viking Press, 1987), 496.

- ⁵⁹ Stoler, 192.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., 56.
- ⁶¹ Pogue, *Education of a General*, 262, and Stoler, 56.
- ⁶² Pogue, *Ordeal and Hope*, 13-15.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ John T. Nelson, *General George C. Marshall: Strategic Leadership and the Challenges of Reconstituting the Army, 1939-41* (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, 1993), 56.
- ⁶⁵ Pogue, *Ordeal and Hope*, 15.
- ⁶⁶ Nelson, 60.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Pogue, *Ordeal and Hope*, 109.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., 111.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷¹ John T. Nelson, John T., *General George C. Marshall: Strategic Leadership and the Challenges of Reconstituting the Army, 1939-41* (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, 1993), 61.
- ⁷² Pogue, *Ordeal and Hope*, 111.
- ⁷³ Cray, 177.
- ⁷⁴ DDE to JSDE, 19 June 1943; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).
- ⁷⁵ DDE, "R.O.T.C. Graduation Muster Speech."
- ⁷⁶ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 317.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., 314.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., 453-54.
- ⁷⁹ DDE to JSDE, 2 November 1944; PPP, PF, *Box 173* (Abilene, KS: DDEL).
- ⁸⁰ Greenstein, 34.

- ⁸¹ Ibid., 115.
- ⁸² DDE, “R.O.T.C. Graduation Muster Speech.”
- ⁸³ DDE to JSDE, 2 November 1944.
- ⁸⁴ DDE, *Crusade in Europe*, 314-5.
- ⁸⁵ Greenstein, 32.
- ⁸⁶ Greenstein, 81.
- ⁸⁷ Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 224.
- ⁸⁸ Puryear, *American Generalship*, 5.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid., 595-6.
- ⁹⁰ Greenstein, 236.
- ⁹¹ Ambrose *The Supreme Commander*, 595-6.
- ⁹² Greenstein, 77.
- ⁹³ Ibid., 73.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid., 81.
- ⁹⁵ Pach and Richardson, 6.
- ⁹⁶ Greenstein, 236.
- ⁹⁷ DDE, “R.O.T.C. Graduation Muster Speech.”

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

After carefully considering the lives and leadership skills of these Army officers, it is evident in this thesis that Marshall and Eisenhower had similar leadership styles. Indeed, their leadership styles reflected their upbringing in small towns, work ethic, desire to learn, concern for religion and morality, attention to officer mentorship, and beliefs about duty, discipline, politics, and working with subordinates. Current and future officers need to consider how these aspects of Marshall's and Eisenhower's leadership apply to their own leadership styles. This thesis serves as an historical analysis of the successful leadership styles of two superb American military leaders. All Soldiers, officers and enlisted, should consider how they lived their lives, as well as how they led and served in the army.

Both Marshall and Eisenhower were professional officers who were focused on improving the army, led morally focused lives, and loyally fulfilled their duties as army officers. Both were not intellectually strong as students and both openly acknowledged this. However, what they lacked in academic skills they both compensated for in the army with a tireless work ethic. In both cases, each worked so fortuitously that they needed medical attention because of the stress they suffered. They could not help working so diligently because the army was their first priority and the real focus in their lives. In short, they lived and breathed the army and did all that they could to change and improve it for those that followed. Since it was the focus of their lives, they spend a great deal of time genuinely concerned about the capabilities of the army as well as the health and welfare of Soldiers.

Both expected much from subordinates, but Marshall always kept a professional separation between ranks and between officers and enlisted Soldiers. Like his father and Pershing, he came across as cold, aloof, demanding at times, precise to a fault, stern with subordinates, righteously Victorian, prudish, and sometimes as a “stuffed shirt.” Behind this façade, however, his men knew that he was in charge and that he genuinely cared about their physical and spiritual well being. Conversely, Eisenhower was warmer, more familiar, and more cordial with subordinate officers and enlisted men. His approach seemed more like how his mother was with him and his siblings. He believed in working together to solve problems, as Soldiers understood his decision was the final word. He approached Soldiers with open ended questions to gauge their responses to issues, and he genuinely wanted to hear what they had to say and Soldier’s knew this. Despite how both were perceived by those they led, they genuinely wanted to improve the army, and they cared for their troops and wanted to ensure that they understood their duty to their country.

As Soldiers and leaders they understood their duty to support and defend the Constitution at all costs, and they adhered to that principal throughout their careers. They viewed their duty as something they were honor bound to fulfill. In many instances their actions compelled them to bluntly disagree with those appointed over them. They were not “yes men,” but they did not disagree unless they were sure they were correct about their facts. As a result, they sometimes provided their superiors with candid yet carefully considered remarks without apology. Senior officers knew this about them, and they knew that their comments were selfless in nature and given from a perspective of benefiting the army. In addition, it also demonstrated that they had the courage and the

character to risk their careers to stand up for something for which they believed. For both Marshall and Eisenhower, these types of leadership skills endeared them to senior military leaders such as Pershing, Conner, and Bell, as well as their troops, politicians, and the American public.

Both men received mentorship and guidance from senior leaders and their careers clearly benefited from these opportunities. From their connections with these mentors, each was able to attend beneficial military schools, as well as receive assistance with promotions, assignments, and career enhancing missions. Indeed, cronyism was obviously a facet of how these men achieved greatness. Without connections from prominent senior officers, these men likely would not be the military icons they are today.

Cronyism was a facet of army life then, and it is still a facet of army life today. Soldiers need to understand this and they need to set the army as their number one priority. They also need to work diligently to fulfill their duties to the army and without concern for reward or recognition. By doing this, senior officers may eventually recognize their talents and advance their careers. When cronyism is used to advance leaders who are competent and have proved themselves in difficult situations, then cronyism benefits the army and the individual, and is a threat to our enemies. However, if cronyism is used as a means to advance officers due to friendships or other types of connections to senior officers, then cronyism forces officers to rise to the level of their incompetence. This is detrimental to the army, the Soldier, and those they lead, and it helps our enemies.

Another facet of cronyism that is clear from the careers of these two men is that

there are times when mentors need to intervene to assist their protégés for career advancement or to circumvent malicious intentions made by other officers with narcissistic intentions. Leaders need to consider the importance of this aspect of mentoring subordinates in their leadership styles. There will undoubtedly come a time when a protégé will need support from those that want to ruin their careers, and it is with a fair and clear mind that leaders need to consider when and when not to support those they have led.

Due to their hard work and the mentorship they received, these men became prominent, successful military leaders, with leadership styles that inspired officers of their time and hopefully will continue to inspire officers today. They came from humble, religiously focused beginnings in small rural towns. Both were well versed in Christian religious doctrine, and both purposely inculcated Christian theology into the army. Indeed, both Marshall and Eisenhower had an almost spiritual connection to their duty to the Constitution and the army. They were truly civil-military religious leaders for the Army, and at a time when good was clearly battling evil. Marshall and Eisenhower were intent on creating a morally focused, Christian army that could fight a crusade during World War II, as well as future crusades against any evil force that confronted America in the future. To this extent they succeeded, albeit the effects of their efforts are waning in the army of today.

Both men set the army as their number one priority, but neither neglected their families. When off duty, they were honorable men committed to enjoying life with their families. Despite the endless hours of work, often in distant lands, both men kept their families close to their hearts and kept their relationships strong. This one facet of their

lives serves as a testament to how these men lived. They honored their marital vows, kept promises they made, and worked hard to fulfill their duties as both a Soldier and husband. Indeed, neither man committed adultery nor divorced his wife due to the stressors of the jobs he had in the army. For some leaders today, this aspect of soldiering is a Gordian Knot that they cannot figure out. As a result, many officers give in to temptation and commit dishonorable acts that reflect poorly on themselves and the army.

In addition, to being civil-military religious leaders, both Marshall and Eisenhower understood the impact that politics had on the army and on Soldiers. Marshall always stayed clear of politics while he was in uniform. He did not vote, he avoided and squelched discussions about it, and he never ran for elected office. Marshall did this because he understood the absolute commitment of his duty to the Constitution. Eisenhower also publicly avoided discussion about politics when he was in uniform. It is clear, however, that with his close friends he did engage in political discourse, and that he had every intention of running for elected office once he completed his service in the army. On this point, Marshall's leadership style is more in line with good order and discipline in the army. Eisenhower would no doubt agree despite his interest in having private political tête-à-têtes with his peers. Despite this mild difference, both men demonstrated adept and clever leadership skills when negotiating sometimes prickly political issues. As senior military leaders, they also knew how to work with politicians to get things accomplished for the army. Politicians respected them as candid and forthright military leaders who provided sincere and unvarnished responses when questioned. In this capacity, therefore, both men fit the Washington-Cincinnatus military leader profile.

It is undoubtedly the case that neither Marshall nor Eisenhower foresaw the great leaders that they would one day become. They fulfilled their duties at work and at home, kept their priorities straight, avoided social and moral pitfalls, kept religion close to their hearts, and deftly navigated political minefields. As a result, their leadership styles should serve as a lesson for all future officers in the military.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Collections at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kansas (hereafter DDEL)

Papers of Dwight D. Eisenhower
United States Army DA 201 File

Books

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *At Ease: Stories I Tell to Friends*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

———. *Crusade in Europe*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1948.

———. *Eisenhower: At War: 1943-1945*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1986.

———. *The Eisenhower Diaries*. Edited by Robert H. Ferrell. New York: Norton, 1981.

———. *The Eisenhower Essays*. New York: The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 1969.

Griffith, Robert. *Ike's Letters To A Friend: 1941-1958*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1984.

Hobbs, Joseph Patrick. *Dear General: Eisenhower's Wartime Letters to Marshall*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Marshall, George C. *Memoirs of My Services in the World War, 1917-1918*. Edited by James L. Collins, Jr. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

———. *George C. Marshall Interviews and Reminiscences for Forrest C. Pogue*. Edited by Larry I. Bland. 3d ed. Lexington, VA: George C. Marshall Foundation, 1996.

———. *The Papers of George C. Marshall*. Edited by Larry I. Bland and Sharon Ritenour Stevens. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.

———. *Selected Speeches and Statements of General of the Army George C. Marshall: Chief of Staff, United States Army*. Edited by Major H. A. DeWeerd. Washington, DC: The Infantry Journal, 1945.

Marshall, Katherine Tupper. *Together: Annals of an Army Wife*. New York: Tupper and Love, 1946.

Taylor, Allan. *What Eisenhower Thinks*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1952.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Alperovitz, Gar. *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam, 3rd Edition*. London: Pluto Press, 2000.

Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990.

———. *The Supreme Commander: The War Years of General Dwight D. Eisenhower*. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Bogle, Lori Lyn. *The Pentagon's Battle for the American Mind: The Early Cold War*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.

Brendon, Piers. *Ike: His Life and Times*. New York: Harper & Row, 1986.

Burk, Robert Fredrick. *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Hero and Politician*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1970.

Cray, Ed. *General of the Army: George C. Marshall, Soldier and Statesman*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1990.

Donovan, Robert J. *Eisenhower: The Inside Story*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

Frye, William. *Marshall: Citizen Soldier*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1947.

Greenstein, Fred I. *The Hidden Hand Presidency: Eisenhower as Leader*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Hogan, Michael J. *Hiroshima in History and Memory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Hudson, Wilma J. *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Young Military Leader*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.

- Kornitzer, Bela. *The Great American Heritage: The Story of the Five Eisenhower Brothers*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1955.
- Lee, R. Alton. *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Soldier and Statesmen*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1981.
- Mayer, Michael S. *The Eisenhower Presidency and the 1950s*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998.
- Medhurst, Martin J. *Eisenhower's War of Words: Rhetoric and Leadership*. Michigan State University Press, 1994.
- Morgan, Kay Summersby. *Past Forgetting: My Love Affair with Dwight D. Eisenhower*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1976.
- Murray, G. E. Patrick. *Eisenhower versus Montgomery: The Continuing Debate*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1996.
- Nelson, John T. *General George C. Marshall: Strategic Leadership and the Challenges of Reconstituting the Army, 1939-41*. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, 1993.
- O'Connor, Richard. *Black Jack Pershing*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.
- O'Neill, Barry. *Honor, Symbol, and War*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- Pach, Chester J., Jr., and Elmo Richardson. *The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991.
- Parker, Jerome H., IV. "Fox Conner and Dwight Eisenhower: Mentoring and Application." *Military Review*, July-August, 2005. FindArticles.com. Available from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0PBZ/is_4_85/ai_n15674593 (accessed November 16, 2007).
- Payne, Robert. *The Marshall Story: A Biography of General George C. Marshall*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.
- Perret, Geoffrey. *Eisenhower*. Holbrook, MA: Adams Media Corporation, 1999.
- Perry, Mark. *Partners in Command: George Marshall and Dwight Eisenhower in War and Peace*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2007.
- Pickett, William B. *Dwight David Eisenhower and American Power*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1995.

- Pierard, Richard V. and Robert D. Linder. *Civil Religion & the Presidency*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1988.
- Pogue, Forrest C. *George C. Marshall*. Four Volumes. New York: Viking Press, 1963-87.
- . *George C. Marshall: Global Commander*. The Harmon Memorial Lecture Series in Military History, Number Ten. Colorado Springs, CO: United States Air Force Academy, 1968.
- . *George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939*. Editorial assistance of Gordon Harrison. New York: Viking Press, 1963.
- . *George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- . *George C. Marshall: Statesman, 1945-1959*. New York: Viking Press, 1987.
- Puryear, Edgar F., Jr. *Nineteen Stars: A Study in Military Character and Leadership*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1992.
- . *American Generalship: Character is Everything: The Art of Command*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 2000.
- Rosten, Leo. *Religions of America: Ferment and Faith in an Age of Crisis, A new Guide and Almanac*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.
- Sherwood, Robert E. *Roosevelt and Hopkins*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Skutt, Mary Sutton. *Growing Up, by George: George C. Marshall's Early Years Uniontown, Pennsylvania-Lexington, Virginia, 1880-1901*. Lexington, VA: News-Gazette, 1997.
- Spector, Ronald H. *Advice and Support: The Early Years, 1941-1960*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 1983.
- Stoler, Mark A. *George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the American Century*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1989.
- Uldrich, Jack. *Soldier, Statesman, Peacemaker: Leadership Lessons from George C. Marshall*. New York: AMACOM, 2005.
- Weintraub, Stanley. *15 Stars: Eisenhower, MacArthur, Marshall: Three Generals Who Saved the American Century*. New York: Free Press, 2007.

Articles

- Greenstein, Fred I. and Richard H. Immerman. "What Did Eisenhower Tell Kennedy About Indochina? The Politics of Misperception." *The Journal of American History*, 79 (September 1992): 568-587.
- Griffith, Robert. "Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Corporate Commonwealth." *American Historical Review*, 87 (February 1982): 87-122.
- IRA. "Eisenhower's Ideology in World War II," *Armed Forces & Society* 23 (Summer 97): 595.
- Rabe, Stephen G. "Eisenhower Revisionism: A Decade of Scholarship." *Diplomatic History*, 17 (Winter 1993): 97-115.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. "Are Military Adultery Standards Changing? What are the Implications?" Hearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring, and The District of Columbia. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, October 7, 1998. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1998. Text-fiche.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
250 Gibbon Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2314

Defense Technical Information Center/OCA
825 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite 944
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Jonathan M. House, Ph.D., Thesis Committee Chair
Department of Military History
USACGSC
1 Reynolds Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352

Bradford A. Wineman, Ph.D.
Department of Military History
USACGSC
1 Reynolds Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352

Robert J. Reilly, M.S.
Department of Command Leadership
USACGSC
1 Reynolds Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352